

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

P.B. 811.309

Ks 949

89160

THE DATE OF KĀLIDĀSA

(Reprint from the Allahabad University Studies, Vol. II)

BY

KSHETRES'ACHANDRA CHATTOPADHYĀYA

Lecturer in Sanskrit

Allahabad University, Allahabad

PRINTED BY

K MITTRA, AT THE INDIAN PRESS, LTD.,
ALLAHABAD

1928

ADDENDUM

P. 140, l. 20, etc. "The King of Rājagṛha"

The expression is wrong and is due to the old reading "*Rājagaha-Napam pīdāpayati*" (l. 8). Khāravela does not say that Rājagṛha was the capital of Bahasatimitra. Mr. Jayaswal's revised reading "*Rājagaham upa-pīdāpayati*" (J. B. O. R. S., IV, p. 378), which had formerly escaped my notice, simply shows that Khāravela came in conflict with the Magadhan power at Rājagṛha and he may not have entered the capital of Magadha till the twelfth year of his reign (l. 12). There is no ground for assuming that Rājagṛha and not Pāṭaliputra was the capital of Magadha in Khāravela's time. [*Vipamumcitum* in l. 8 of the inscription is probably gerundial in sense though infinitive in form, a not infrequent usage in (Ardhamāgadhi) Jaina texts.]

N. B.—P. 140, n. 3, l. 4, — 'Vatsa' should be 'Vidīṣa'.

CORRIGENDA

PAGE	LINE	FOR	SUBSTITUTE
82	32	or rather "pricking, etc...	or rather on "pricking, etc.
83	18	बुद्धवा बुद्धवा
85	17	शुद्धैर्मनाभिः शुद्धैर्मनाभिः
	28	शेवेन्द्रियवृत्तिरासां	... शेवेन्द्रियवृत्तिरासां
86	17	व्रीडादमुं व्रीडादमुं
91	20	सस्वेष्टवधिको सस्वेष्टवधिको
	21	Kṣudra-mṛgas	... Kṣudra-mṛgas
	22	Mṛgas Mṛgas
		Mṛga Mṛga
93	15	क्षतः । क्षतः ।
	22	व्रजतोः व्रजतोः
98	8	Kāilāsa Kailāsa
100	23	क्वचित् "क्वचित्
101	20	पितृणां पितृणां
	25	गगणतलादभ्युपगम्य	... गगणतलादभ्युपगम्य
102	2	पणमुख पणमुख-
	34	Bandhana-Mocana	... Bandhana-mocana
109	28	Bhāsa Bhāsa,
110	14	M. S. Ms.
	19	11 a 3) 11 a 3(
	26	उत्समिदं उत्समिदं
111	24	Karpuramañjarī	... Karpūramañjarī
113	8	not impossible ?	... not impossible in that country ?
	27	contemporary, Kuṣān	... contemporary Kuṣān
123	32	Harit Harit
124	4	V. 61 v. 61

PAGE	LINE	FOR	SUBSTITUTE
128	23	Hun ...	Han
130	35	Pvṣkaraṇa	Puṣkaraṇa
131	36	Sāstra ...	Śāstra
132	40	कोशलांश्चान्ध्रपौण्ड्रांश्च	“ कोशलांश्चान्ध्रपौण्ड्रांश्च
133	21	व्याप्य ...	व्याप्य
136	5	Verses ...	verses
		Verse ...	verse
146	37	Śakadvīpa	Śakadvīpa
148	3	Suṣeṇa ...	Suṣeṇa
149	31	Lüder ...	Lüders
161	20	Bāveru Jātaka (the	Bāveru Jātaka, (the
	32	Lagīda ...	Lagidai
163	26	χηλαι ...	χηλαι
164	27	सभिप्रायत्वं ...	साभिप्रायत्वं
	28	दिष्ट्या ...	दिष्ट्या
167	24	Ārāyadeva	Āryadeva
	29	sthūla-hastā = valepa	sthūla-hastā'-valepa
	32	रगहिभयं ...	रागाद्यहिभयं
169	25	in Ku., that	in Ku. that
170	23	argumants ...	arguments
	26	Chawdhuri	Chaudhuri
	31	S. P. ...	P. S.
	34	migh ...	might
	40	ननः ...	नमः

THE DATE OF KĀLIDĀSA¹

कालीं देवीं मनसि निहितां पूजयित्वा मयादौ
 कालस्तस्य प्रथितयशसः कालिदासाङ्गयस्य ।
 सभ्यत्वं वै खलु गतवतो विक्रमादित्यनाम्नो
 राज्ञो दिष्टः सुललितकवेस्तथ्यमीमांसनेन ॥
 अश्वाख्यो यो जिनवरकविर्बुद्धकाव्यादिकर्ता
 पूर्वं जातो नहि रघुकवेर्निश्चयोऽसौ दृढो मे ।
 शृण्वन्त्वेतद् विबुधनिकराः पक्षपातं विसृज्य
 तुष्टः स्याद्यन् मयि किल गुरुः श्रीमहानन्ददेवः ॥

Mr. K. G. Sankara has tried to show in the second number of the Indian Historical Quarterly (vol. I, pp. 309—316) that in spite of the almost unanimous view of scholars to the contrary, Kālidāsa should be assigned to the first century before Christ, and he seems to me to have made a strong case. Mr. Sankara has before this expressed himself in favour of the usually assigned date of 4th—5th century A.D.,² and his present change of view seems remarkable. When I was first acquainted with Aśvaghoṣa's Saundarananda and its concluding

¹ The following abbreviations, besides those most usual, are used here :—*Bu.* for Buddhacarita, *Sau.* for Saundarananda, *Ku.* for Kumārasambhava, *Ra.* for Raghuvamśa, *Me.* for Meghadūta, *E.H.I.* for Smith's Early History of India (4th edition), *C.H.I.* for Cambridge History of India, *D.K.A.* for Pargiter's Dynasties of the Kali Age, *I.H.Q.* for Indian Historical Quarterly, *Q.J.M.S.* for Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore, *J.B.O.R.S.* for Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, *A.B.I.* for Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, *A.H.D.* for G. Jouveau-Dubreuil's Ancient History of the Deccan.

² Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, vol. VIII pp. 278—292, vol. IX, 17—56, X, 188—190, and Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, vol. II, pp. 189—191.

verses in my undergraduate days I formed an impression that Aśvaghōṣa was the borrower and not Kālidāsa. Later studies confirmed me in my opinion. I am therefore fully in accord with what Mr. Sankara now says about the relations between Kālidāsa and Aśvaghōṣa on p. 312 of this article. Some four years ago when lecturing to my class on the history of Sanskrit literature I began a thorough study of the question, which, unfortunately, could not be finished at the time. My studies having now taken an altogether different line, I can no more hope to be able to return to it. But as some new facts had come to my notice or new interpretations occurred to me, which could probably be utilised by specialists in the field, I take this occasion of publishing them, *unequivocally admitting the incompleteness and other deficiencies of my work*. The present paper should be taken as a supplement to Mr. Sankara's and should be read with it.

Since Cowell published the Buddhacarita and wrote in its preface (pp. x, xi, xii) about the relation between Kālidāsa and Aśvaghōṣa, scholars have assumed that the former had borrowed from the latter. And this is but natural, for has not Darwin made evolutionists of us all? The "finished picture" must be later than and have come out of the "rude sketch." There is no inherent improbability in this assumption, for Buddhist tradition knows Aśvaghōṣa as a great poet, and if Dr. Thomas is right in identifying him with Āryaśūra and Mātṛceta,¹ the number of works written by him was very large. Such a prolific writer would hardly lack in originality. One fragmentary drama has been discovered in Central Asia, claiming to be written by Aśvaghōṣa, and two more found with this manuscript have been ascribed to him.² That Aśvaghōṣa

¹ Kavindravacanāsamuccaya, Introduction, p. 25 (also Album Kern, pp. 405—8, and Indian Antiquary, pp. 345—360.).

² The Śāriputraprakaraṇa of Aśvaghōṣa published by Professor H. Lüders in the Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1911, pp. 388—411 (with two plates) and Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, hrsg. v. H. Lüders, Berlin, 1911.

was invited, according to Paramārtha,¹ to give a literary form to the *Vibhāṣā* compiled by Kātyāyanīputra and others, clearly establishes his fame as a writer. There is also nothing incongruous in the great Kālidāsa's borrowing here and there from this "Buddhist Ennius," for can it in any way detract from the great merits of our poet Rabindranath Tagore, says a certain scholar, that his poems show the influence of the Vaiṣṇava poets of mediæval Bengal? I fully admit that this assumption of scholars has nothing unnatural about it, but is it grounded on so strong evidence that we must take it as correct? Is not Hemacandra's position in Jaina literature somewhat similar to that of Aśvaghoṣa in Buddhist and is not Hemacandra under a deep debt of gratitude to a whole host of preceding writers? The analogy of our Rabindranath also seems to me to be inappropriate, but I shall not discuss it here. I compared some of the similar passages in Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa, and many of them clearly indicated who borrowed from whom—the uniform indication being that it was Aśvaghoṣa who had borrowed. I had wanted to make a detailed study of all the works of Aśvaghoṣa and to trace the development of his literary style, but inaccessibility of sources and the diversion of my own studies to other channels prevented me from doing all that I wanted to. But I present my unfinished picture before scholars in the hope that if they are convinced of its correctness in main features in spite of deficiencies, somebody better equipped than myself may some day take it up, finish it and remove its shortcomings.

¹ Life of Vasubandhu, translated by J. Takakusu ("T'oung-pao," 1904—p. 12 of its reprint). Dr. Takakusu published in the J.R.A.S. for 1905 a summary of Paramārtha's Life of Vasubandhu and a discussion of its contents. Scholars who are not satisfied with his views about Vindhyavāsa and his identification with the author of the *Sāṅkhyakārikās* will do well to read his translation of Paramārtha's Life of Vasubandhu in the "T'oung-pao," whose careful study led me to reject Dr. Takakusu's own inferences.

The concluding verses of the Saundarananda, referred to above, which set me on this track, are:—

इत्येषा व्युपशान्तये न रतये मोक्षार्थगर्भाकृतिः
 श्रोतॄणां ग्रहणार्थमन्यमनसां काव्योपचाराकृता ।
 यन्मोक्षाकृतमन्यदत्र हि मया तत्काव्यधर्मात् कृतं
 पातुं तिक्तमिवौषधं मधुयुतं हृद्यं कथं स्यादिति ॥
 श्रायेणालोक्य लोकं विषयरतिपरं मोक्षात् प्रतिहतं
 काव्यव्याजेन तत्त्वं कथितमिह मया मोक्षपरमिति ।
 तद्बुद्ध्वा शमिकं यत् तद्वहितमितो ग्राह्यं न ललितं
 पांशुभ्यो धातुजेभ्यो नियतमुपकरं चामीकरमिति ॥

These verses show that Āśvaghoṣa does not claim to be a professed poet. Actually he is more of a metaphysician (or a monk) than a poet, in spite of what Mr. Nariman says of him,¹ for he is seldom so eloquent, so impressive, as when he writes on religious or philosophical topics. He has written this work “for the extinction of desire and not for enjoyment of pleasures” “in the form of a *kāvya*,” “but making it contain teachings of salvation,” that its “readers (lit. listeners), who are by nature turned to other thoughts, may understand it (and take it to heart)”; “what has been written elsewhere in the form of a religious text” is being repeated by our author “in the way of a *kāvya*, as a bitter medicine is mixed with honey when given to a patient to drink that it may be acceptable to him.” This at once shows that Āśvaghoṣa writes under a constraint. He would rather write directly about *mokṣa*, as he says he has done already, but men are “mad after things of enjoyment and averse to salvation”; he has therefore no help but “to teach salvation (which involves abandonment of all enjoyments) under the cloak of a (pleasant) *kāvya*.” One should carefully ponder over these words. Would we expect originality here? Āśvaghoṣa was out on paying the world in its own coin, or rather¹ “pricking out the thorn with another,” as the Sanskrit expression goes. He will charm men with the

¹ Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, 1st ed. (1920), p. 32.

poetic form they are accustomed to, but he will charm them out of their passions. Such a writer would best achieve his end by taking up the popular work or works of some professed poet or poets and modelling his work thereon and it seems to me that Āśvaghoṣa has actually done this. I can never deny that Āśvaghoṣa had the gifts of a true poet, that his *Saundarananda* and *Buddhacarita*¹ abound in highly poetical passages which can rank with any other in Sanskrit literature and, whatever may be the ordinary expectation, he is not wanting in originality in his poetry. If a philosopher is constrained to write poetry, he will naturally read and try to imitate poems of professed poets; but if he is himself not blessed by the Muses, his attempt will be a poor caricature. Such could not be the case with Āśvaghoṣa who had the gifts of a real poet but whose lines were cast in other fields. He too seems to have turned to other models but his genius enabled him to transcend them soon. The last half of the concluding verse of the *Saundarananda*, “तद्बुद्ध्वा शमिकं यत् तदवहितमितो ग्राह्यं न ललितं पांशुभ्यो धातुजेभ्यो नियतमुपकरं चामीकरमिति,” “therefore discriminating, what is there conducive to the extinction of desires in this work should be accepted by readers and not what is about enjoyment, as pure gold is always accepted after separating it from the dross that adheres to it in the ore,” clearly indicates Āśvaghoṣa’s models. Is not the reader at once reminded of Kālidāsa’s “तं सन्तः श्रोतुमर्हन्ति सदसद्व्यक्तिहेतवः । हेमनः संलक्ष्यते ह्यग्नौ विशुद्धिः श्यामिकापि वा ॥” (*Raghuvansha*, I. 10), “Good men who can discriminate between good and bad should listen to this *kāvya*, for it is in fire that the purity or otherwise of gold is tested,” which in spite of differences shows a genetic connexion? That Kālidāsa could have taken the idea from Āśvaghoṣa and expressed it in a happy context is *a priori* not impossible, but some of the other passages agreeing in the two authors clearly prove Āśvaghoṣa’s indebtedness. ‘रतये’ “for

* ¹ I omit from consideration the Gaṇḍī-stotra and the other religious works.

enjoyment," is certainly a good description of Kālidāsa's poems, which are all lavish in their erotism, the bigger, the Raghuvamśa and the Kumārasambhava,¹ both "ending in the sweetness of erotics."

Since the publication of what Cowell wrote in his preface to the Buddhacarita (pp. x, xi), it has been customary to point out the great similarity between Buddhacarita, III, 13—24, and Raghuvamśa, VII, 5—12, but Mr. Sankara has done very well in pointing out that the similarity extends to two more verses (16 and 17) of the Raghuvamśa and that Kālidāsa has said the self-same words in Kumārasambhava, VII, 56—70. I am in complete agreement with what Mr. Sankara says and I need not repeat his words. But a few sentences of the late Mr. Sāradāranjan Ray on this subject deserve quotation: "When an author repeats in one book what he has written in another, it is sure sign that he is repeating his favourite ideas. On this consideration, the presumption is that *Kālidāsa is the author of these common ideas*. If he were not, he would not have paraded them this way. The thief does not make a display of stolen goods."² Another remark of Principal Ray, made with reference to the rising from sleep of Aśvaghōṣa's damsels to see the prince (ताः सस्तकाञ्चीगुणविभ्रिताश्च सुसप्रबुद्धाकुललोचनाश्च । वृत्तान्तविन्यस्तविभुषयाश्च कौतूहलेनापि भृताः [वृताः ?] परीयुः ॥ Bu., III. 14), may be quoted: "The prince did not pass at midnight, and it is difficult to understand this sleep in high quarters."³ Aśvaghōṣa was obviously

¹ I believe that Kālidāsa wrote only the first eight cantos and the rest came from another hand. What made the poet leave Kumārasambhava (a work certainly earlier than the Raghuvamśa and therefore not the last writing of the author) unfinished cannot be determined now. Did the impropriety of *jaganmātāpītṛ-sambhogavarṇana* occur to him and made him leave aside his pen? If so, the Kumāra must be a posthumous publication. Such a supposition would explain the verbatim repetition of some lines of the poem in the later Raghuvamśa. For another possible explanation see below.

² Śakuntalā, 5th ed., Calcutta, 1920, Introduction, p. 24.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

thinking of the two descriptions in Kālidāsa of bridegrooms going to the marriage, which is nowadays held at night. But some doubt about similar custom in Kālidāsa's days is cast by Ku., VII. 63, “तावत्पताकाकुलमिन्दुमौलिहस्तोरयं राजपथं प्रपेदे । प्रासादश्चक्राणि दिवापि कुर्वन्ज्योत्स्नाभिषेकद्विगुणद्युतीनि ॥,” where Mahādeva is described as going by day.¹ Be that as it may, the fourth line of Aśvaghōṣa's verse, “कौतूहलेनापि भृताः (वृताः ?) परीयुः ॥,” “they went about surrounded on all sides by curiosity,” clearly betrays the influence of Ku., VII. 62, and Ra., VII. 11, “तासां मुखैरासवगन्धगर्भैर्व्याप्तान्तराः सान्द्रकुतूहलानाम् । विलोलनेत्रभ्रमरैर्गवाक्षाः सहस्रपत्राभरणा इवासन् ॥” *Kautūhala* (mentioned also in Kālidāsa's verse) is conceived by Aśvaghōṣa as surrounding² the damsels in imitation of the *netra-bhramara* of Kālidāsa's beauties buzzing over their lotus-like faces. The simile of the lotus has not been forgotten by Aśvaghōṣa as I shall presently show. The last half of Bu., III. 23, “धन्यास्य भार्येति शनैरवोचञ् शुद्धैर्मनाभिः खलु नान्यभावात्,” “they said slowly *with pure hearts and not from any other motive* ‘Blessed is his wife,’” completely proves, as Mr. Sankara has pointed out,³ that Aśvaghōṣa was thinking of a similar occasion where the damsels did feel the dart of love. That Aśvaghōṣa had Kālidāsa's description in mind, is proved without the possibility of any doubt when we compare the passages in the Raghuvamśa and the Kumārasambhava, particularly the following verses :—

Ra.
ता रावणं दृष्टिमिरापिबन्त्यो
नार्यो न जग्मुर्विषयान्तराणि ।
तथा हि शोभेन्द्रियवृत्तिरासां
सर्वात्मना चक्षुरिव प्रविष्टा ॥१२॥

Ku.
तमेकदृश्यं नयनैः पिबन्त्यो
नार्यो न जग्मुर्विषयान्तराणि ।
तथाहि शोभेन्द्रियवृत्तिरासां
सर्वात्मना चक्षुरिव प्रविष्टा ॥६४॥

¹ Was Aśvaghōṣa misled by the mention of ज्योत्स्ना ? Probably he places the prince's journey very early in the morning.

² वृताः, my emendation for भृताः which hardly makes any sense.

³ Similarly, Mr. Dhanapati Banerji, in Q. J. M. S., X., p. 87, and S. Ray, Śakuntalā Intro., pp. 27-8. I am indebted to Professor Dr. Radhakumud Mukherji for having drawn my attention to Mr. Banerji's paper.

Ra.

स्थाने वृता भूपतिभिः परोक्षैः
 स्वयंवरं साधुममस्त भोज्या ।
 पद्मेव नारायणमन्यथासौ
 लभेत कान्तं कथमात्मतुल्यम् ॥१३॥
 परस्परेण स्पृहणीयशोभं
 न चेदिदं द्वन्द्वमयोजयिष्यत् ।
 अस्मिन् द्वये रूपविधानयत्नः
 पत्युः प्रजानां वितथोऽभविष्यत् ॥१४॥
 रतिस्मरौ नूनमिमावभूतां
 राज्ञां सहस्रेषु तथा हि बाला ।
 गतेयमात्मप्रतिरूपमेव

मनो हि जन्मान्तरसङ्गतिश्च ॥१५॥ (Compare Sakuntalā, V, भावस्थिराणि
 जननान्तरसौहृदानि)

Ku.

स्थाने तपो दुश्चरमेतदर्थम्
 अपर्याया पेलवयापि तप्तम् ।
 या दास्यमप्यस्य लभेत नारी
 परस्परेण स्पृहणीयशोभं
 न चेदिदं द्वन्द्वमयोजयिष्यत् ।
 अस्मिन् द्वये रूपविधानयत्नः
 पत्युः प्रजानां विफलोऽभविष्यत् ॥१६॥

न नूनमारूढरूपा शरीरम्
 अनेन दग्धं कुसुमायुधस्य ।
 श्री ग्रीडादमुं देवमुदीक्ष्य मन्ये
 संन्यस्तदेहः स्वयमेव कामः ॥१७॥
 अनेन सम्बन्धमुपेत्य दिष्ट्या
 मनोरथप्रार्थितमीश्वरेण ।
 मूर्धानमालि चितिधारणोष्णम्
 उच्चैस्तरं वक्ष्यति शैलराजः ॥१८॥

Kālidāsa seems to make the damsels smitten with love at the bridegroom's beauty and envious of the bride's (and bride's father's) fortune.¹ This is altered by Aśvaghoṣa because Buddha is not a bridegroom going to marry and it also hurts his puritanism that the city damsels should thus feel attracted to a *parapati* (another woman's husband); hence his “*शुद्धैर्मनेभिः खलु नान्यभावात्*.” A certain want of restraint seems manifest in Kālidāsa's beauties, but the damsels in Aśvaghoṣa's poem are made to go out to see the prince 'with the permission of the elders'

¹ See the portions in thick type above and also 'विशेष नारीमनांसीव वतुष्कनन्तः in Ra., VII. 17, and 'जयाइ सार्थ' वनिताकटाक्षैः in the following verse —नारी and वनिता refer to the other women and not to the वधू Indumatī to whose presence Aja is carried after this (VII. 19).

(जनेन मान्येन कृताभ्यनुज्ञा: Bu., III. 13d). Does not this expression when contrasted with Kālidāsa's "इत्थं बभूवुः...त्यक्तान्यकार्याणि विवेष्टितानि (improved into विलोकनानि in Ra.)" 'they thus behaved (or went out to see) leaving all other work' show that the puritan is seeking to improve on his predecessor? Mr. Sankara has rightly drawn attention to the unnecessary repetitions in Aśvaghoṣa and these clearly indicate a novice's hand. There is a slight indelicacy in Ku., VII. 60 (and Ra., VII. 9) "जालान्तरप्रेषितदृष्टिरन्या प्रस्थानभिन्ना न बबन्ध नीवीम् । नाभिप्रविष्टाभरणप्रभेण इस्तेन तस्यावलम्ब्य वासः ॥" which is in characteristic¹ Kālidāsean style and Aśvaghoṣa has avoided it by combining this verse and the following one ("अर्धाचिता सत्वरमुत्थितायाः पदे पदे दुर्निमित्ते गलन्ती । कस्याश्चिदासीद्वशना तदानीमङ्गुष्ठमूलार्पितसूत्रशेषा ॥") into his own "ताः स्रस्तकाञ्चीगुणविघ्निताश्च सुप्तप्रबुद्धाकुललोचनाश्च । वृत्तान्तविन्यस्तविभूषणाश्च कौतूहलेनापि भृताः (वृताः ?) परीयुः ॥" (Bu., VII. 14). Is not "शीघ्रं समर्थापि तु गन्तुमन्या गतिं निजग्राह ययौ न तूर्णम् । द्विया प्रगल्भानि निगूहमाना² रहःप्रयुक्तानि विभूषणानि" ॥ of Bu., III. 17 somewhat obscure and intelligible only in the light of "जालान्तरप्रेषितदृष्टिरन्या" etc., of Kālidāsa, just quoted? In Kālidāsa's description, the bridegroom passes when the ladies are at their toilets which they leave at once. Aśvaghoṣa makes the damsels rise from their sleep³ to see the prince pass by. Reference to finished or unfinished toilet is therefore impossible; but Aśvaghoṣa has repeatedly spoken of the ornaments of

¹ My apologies to the author of the *आचिन माहित* for this expression.

² Kern's emendation *द्विया प्रगल्भा निगूहमाना*, quoted with approbation by A. Gawronski (*Rocznik Oryentalistyczny*, I., p. 23), is an unhappy one. How can one be *pragalbha* (=shameless) through *hrī* (=shame)? The text as it stands gives quite good sense: the damsels felt ashamed of the jingling noise of the ornaments (*mekha-lā*) worn near the privates. But that Aśvaghoṣa makes the damsels *hide* (निगूहमाना) these ornaments—an ineffective way of stopping their noise—and not take them off shows how much he was obsessed by the ideas of Kālidāsa. Aśvaghoṣa's attempts at varying his models often launches him in ludicrous situations.

³ Probably there is nothing incongruous in Aśvaghoṣa's सुप्तप्रबुद्धाकुललोचनाः—he may have made the prince pass very early in the morning when all persons had left not their beds.

the ladies, which do suggest the toilet chamber. Kālidāsa's texts therefore must have been before Aśvaghoṣa. The idea in Kālidāsa's single verse "तासां मुखैरासवगन्धगर्भै-
र्यासान्तराः सान्द्रकुतूहलानाम् । विलोलनेत्रभ्रमरैर्गवाक्षाः सहस्रपत्राभरणा इवासन् ॥"
(Ku., VII. 62 ; Ra., VII. 11) is repeated twice by Aśvaghoṣa :
"वातायनेभ्यस्तु विनिःसृतानि परस्परोपासितकुण्डलानि । स्त्रीणां विरेजुर्मुखपङ्कजानि
सक्तानि हर्म्येष्विव पङ्कजानि ॥१६॥ वातायनानामविशालभावादन्योन्यगण्डार्पित-
कुण्डलानि । मुखानि रेजुः प्रमदोत्तमानां बद्धाः कलापा इव पङ्कजानाम् ॥२१॥"
Does not this clearly indicate who is the plagiarist here ? The puritanic monk has taken care to omit "the fragrance of wine." And "अयं किल व्यायतपीनबाहू रूपेण साक्षादिव पुष्पकेतुः " (Bu., III. 24 a, b) clearly betrays the influence of Ra., VII. 15, and Ku., VII. 67, quoted above.

Professor Cowell said about these agreements : "We must not forget here that in Kālidāsa the description only belongs to an episode in the main poem,—in the Buddhist author it is a natural incident in one of the most important chapters of the whole work. Kālidāsa merely brings in a few characteristic details, as he is hurrying on to the marriage and the subsequent attack by the disappointed rivals ; Aśvaghoṣa dwells in a more leisurely way on the various attitudes and gestures of the women, in order to bring out in bolder relief the central figure of the hero." These statements seem very strange to us. The description in Kālidāsa has as great connexion with the main theme as in Aśvaghoṣa, or rather it may be said that the latter's description is highly inappropriate. It should be noted that the object of feminine curiosity in Kālidāsa is a bridegroom going to marry. Women still flock to windows and roofs of houses, everywhere in India, when a bridegroom passes through the streets in procession. Therefore Kālidāsa's is not a hurried description but an indispensable thing in an Indian poem. For Aśvaghoṣa no justification can be shown ; what the women did is altogether out of place there. His only motive seems to have been to tread in the path of professed poets and then to introduce his religious suggestions ; this he does in

v. 24 c, d—"ल्यक्ता श्रियं धर्ममुपेक्ष्यतीति तस्मिन् हिता गौरवमेव चक्रुः," but unfortunately with some abruptness. The very fact that Kālidāsa's is a short description and Aśvaghoṣa's a "leisurely" one should indicate, unless anything is known or can be established to the contrary, that the latter is the later writer. Is not Aśvaghoṣa more lavish in his expressions in both his works than the renowned master of *Vaidarbhī* style? And are we not aware of the increase in verbosity in Sanskrit literature with the progress of time? One such late poet felt constrained to say in a moment of self-realisation, "मुदे मुरारेमरैः सुमेरोरानीय यस्योपचितस्य शृङ्गैः । भवन्ति नोदामगिरां कवीनामुच्छ्रायसौन्दर्यगुणा मृषोद्याः." ¹ What the Professor says about the impending attack by the disappointed rivals becomes altogether meaningless the moment we substitute the Kumārasambhava in the place of the Raghuvamśa, for no such incident awaits the bridegroom in the former poem. Professor Cowell (p. xi of his Preface) did not shrink from tracing Aśvaghoṣa's influence in Rāmāyaṇa (V. 9-11), but a more sensible writer makes Aśvaghoṣa the imitator. ² I am fully conscious of possible Buddhist influences ³ over Kālidāsa's mind, but what the learned Professor has put down as a Buddhist idea (Preface, xi) fails to appear to me as such. Buddhism seems to have become a name to conjure with and we often find things soberly put down under its especial label, which are neither Buddhist nor Jaina, nor even Brāhmanical, but simply Indian.

In comparing Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa, the Buddhacarita is generally placed by the side of the Raghuvamśa. But a careful study has convinced me that the Buddhacarita agrees more with the Kumārasambhava than with the Raghuvamśa which resembles the Saundarananda more. The editor of the

¹ Śisupālāvadha, IV. 10.

² Keith, "Classical Sanskrit Literature," p. 23.

³ In an *ahimsā* tendency. Are the influences Buddhist or Jain? There was a strong Jaina settlement in Western India in the first century B.C. when, as I shall show below, our poet lived.

Saundarananda has suggested (Preface, iv) that the Buddhacarita was written earlier than the Saundarananda, but I have little hesitation in rejecting this view. Any one who reads the two books carefully will feel convinced that MM. Pandit H. P. Shastri has here gone wrong. Professor Keith¹ rightly considers the Buddhacarita to be the later work. It is because the Saundarananda is his first *kāvya* that Aśvaghoṣa wrote those apologetic lines at the end of the work. When writing the Buddhacarita, his fame as a poet must have been established and he needed no apology. But, of course, we have no means now to determine what were exactly the last words of the Buddhacarita. The Chinese translation² seems to be a condensed version. "To sing the praises of the lordly monk, and (declare) his acts from first to last, 2309; without self-seeking or self-honour, without desire for personal renown, but following what the scriptures say, to benefit the world...2310"³ seems to be connected with the first half of verse 2309, *viz.*, "And having shown the way to all the world, who would not reverence and adore him?" and Beal's supposition that 'has been my aim' is to be supplied to complete the sense seems unwarranted. I shall now give some of the grounds on which I have guessed the especial connexion between the Saundarananda and the Raghuvamśa and between the Buddhacarita and the Kumārasambhava. The parallels I adduce below will not all convince my readers but I doubt not that some will and that the cumulative effect of the evidence will establish my case.

To begin with the Saundarananda, in the third verse of its first canto, "हविषे यश्च स्वात्मार्यं गाममुच्चत वशिष्ठवत् । तपःशिष्टेषु शिष्येषु गामधु(धो)वत् वशिष्ठवत् ॥" said about the sage Gotama, seems to have been suggested by "दुदोह गां स यज्ञाय..." Ra., I. 26, and the reference to Vasiṣṭha in the latter half of the first canto of Ra. and to his cow in that and the following cantos. The sixth

¹ "Classical Sanskrit Literature," p. 22.

² Translated into English by Beal, S.B.E. XIX, Oxford, 1883.

³ S.B.E., XIX, p. 338.

verse “चारुबीरुत्तरुवनः प्रस्निग्धमृदुशादृढलः । हविर्धूमचितानेन यः सदाभ्र इवाबभौ ॥” has some agreements with Ra., II. 17, “स पल्वलोत्तीर्ण-वराहयूथान्यावासवृक्षोन्मुखबर्हिणानि, ययौ मृगाध्यासितशादृढलानि श्यामायमानानि वनानि पश्यन् ॥” Sau., I. 10 “नीवारफलसन्तुष्टैः स्वस्थैः शान्तैरनुत्सुकैः । आकीर्णोऽपि तपोभृङ्गैः शून्यशून्य इवाभवत् ॥” has certainly a resemblance with Ra., I. 50, “आकीर्णमृषिपत्नीनामुदजद्वाररोधिभिः । अपत्यैरिव नीवार-भागधेयोचितैर्मृगैः ॥” and Ra., I. 52, “आतपात्ययसंक्षिप्तनीवारासु निषादिभिः । मृगैर्वर्तितरोमन्थमुदजाङ्गनभूमिषु ॥” (also, Śak., I Act, “नीवाराः शुकगर्भको-टरमुखभ्रष्टास्तरुणामधः प्रस्निग्धाः कचिदिङ्गुदीफलभिदः सूच्यन्त एवोपलाः । विश्वासे-पगमादभिन्नगतयः शब्दं सहन्ते मृगास्तोयाधारपथाश्च वल्कलशिखानित्यन्दरेखाङ्कि-ताः ॥”). There is reference to the sacred fires in Sau., I. 11 and also in Ra., I. 53. Ra., I. 50 and 52, just quoted, seem also to have some connexion with Sau., I. 12, “विरजुः हरिणा यत्र सुप्ता मेध्यासु वेदिषु । सलज्जैर्माधवीपुष्पैरुपहाराः कृता इव ॥” The following verse of the Saundarananda, “अपि क्षुद्रमृगा यत्र शान्ताश्चरुः समं मृगैः । शरण्येभ्यस्तपस्विभ्यो विनयं शिञ्चिता इव ॥” seems to contain matter from two different verses of the Raghuvamśa: “(लताप्रतानोद्ग्रथितैः स केशैरधिज्यधन्वा विचचार दावम् ।) रक्षापदेशान्मुनिहोमधेनोर्धन्यान् विनेष्यन्निव दुष्टसत्त्वान् ।” II. 8 and “(शशाम वृष्ट्यापि विना दवाग्निरासीद्विशेषा फलपुष्प-वृद्धिः ।) ऊनं न सत्त्वेष्वधिको बबाधे तस्मिन् वनं गोप्तरि गाहमाने ॥” II. 14. Āśvaghoṣa makes the Kṣudra-mṛgas (‘small animals’) roam in peace with *mṛgas*. But *mṛga*, by itself, does not mean only the big animal or the ferocious animal, either of which must have been meant by the poet, as शान्ताः (‘peaceful’) and विनयं शिञ्चिताः (‘taught lessons of gentleness’) unmistakably indicate. Kālidāsa has expressly mentioned the ferocious and big animals (‘दुष्टसत्त्वान्’ ‘अधिकः’) and he has also made them and not the weak animals taught lessons of gentleness. This shows that in spite of his attempts at variation, Āśvaghoṣa has betrayed his indebtedness to Kālidāsa. “निगूढज्ञानपौरुषम्” in Sau., I. 52, may have some connexion with Ra., I. 20, “तस्य संवृतमन्त्रस्य गूढाकारेङ्गितस्य च । फलानुमेयाः प्रारम्भाः संस्काराः प्राक्तना इव ॥” Similarly Sau., I. 56, “यस्मादन्यायतस्ते च कञ्चिन्नाचीकरत्करम् । तस्मादल्पेन कालेन तत्तदापपुरन् पुरम् ॥” may have been suggested by Ra., I. 18, “प्रजानामेव भूत्यर्थं स ताम्यो वलिमग्रहीत् । सहस्रगुणमुत्सङ्गदुमादत्ते हि रसं रविः ॥”

The last verse of Saundarananda, canto I, “आचारवान् विनयवान् नयवान् क्रियावान् धर्माय नेन्द्रियसुखाय धृतातपत्रः। तद्भ्रातृभिः परिवृतः स जुगोप राङ्गं संक्रन्दनो दिवमिवानुसृतो मरुद्भिः ॥” has *certain* resemblances, in words, ideas or allusions, to three consecutive verses in Raghuvamśa, canto I (24-26): “प्रजानां विनयाधानादक्षणाद्भरणादपि। स पिता पितरस्तासां केवलं जन्महेतवः ॥ स्थित्यै दण्डयतो दण्ड्यान् परितोऽपि प्रसूतये। अप्यर्थकामौ तस्यास्तां धर्म एव मनीषिणः ॥ दुर्देहं गं स यज्ञाय शस्याय मघवा दिवम्। सम्पद्विनिमयेनोभौ दधतुर्धुवनत्रयम् ॥” It should be noticed that the order has been preserved by Āśvaghōṣa.

Before I pass on to the next canto of the Saundarananda, I must draw the attention of my readers to a particular feature of these resemblances. One may object about my inferences that such coincidences are natural when there is agreement in the subject-matter and they do not necessarily imply borrowing. But would resemblances extend so far and be also almost in the same order without a genetic connexion? I have shown that some passages in Āśvaghōṣa can be explained only in the light of Kālidāsa's words. Kālidāsa therefore must have written first. Then the pre-history of the Śākya and their wanderings in the forest (the subject-matter of Sau., I.) which gave occasion to Āśvaghōṣa to write those passages resembling Ra., I, properly form no part of his real story. His main theme is the conversion of Nanda, half-brother of the Buddha, and all that is directly connected with it—including Nanda's birth and ancestry. What comes before canto II is therefore irrelevant. But Kālidāsa is writing the whole history of the Raghus and he must start from the very beginning. Then, his sending of the king Dilīpa to the forest has an artistic significance¹ and is intimately connected with the poet's own deep love of nature.

Let us now proceed with the second canto of the Saundarananda. We notice the similarity of verse 4, “वपुष्मांश्च न च स्तब्धो दक्षिणो न च नार्जवः। तेजस्वी न च न क्षान्तः कर्ता च न च

¹ The greatest prince in the line is Rāma. He had to live long in the forest before he became king. Daśaratha obtained Rāma after hunting in the woods. Dilīpa's forest life for progeny at the beginning of the story prepares us for all this.

विस्मितः ॥” with Ra., I. 21-22 “जुगोपात्मानमन्नस्तो भेजे धर्ममनातुरः ।
 अगृभु रांददे सोऽर्थमसक्तः सुखमन्वभूत् ॥ ज्ञाने मौनं क्षमा शक्तौ त्यागे श्लाघाविपर्ययः ।
 गुणा गुणानुबन्धित्वात्तस्य सप्रसवा इव ॥” It is difficult to avoid connect-
 ing v. 6, “यः पूर्वं राजभिर्यातां यियासुर्धर्मपद्धतिम् । राज्यं दीक्षामिव वहन्
 वृत्तेनान्वगमत्पितृन् ॥” with Ra., I. 17, “रेखामात्रमपि क्षुण्णादा मनोवर्त्मनः
 परम् । न व्यतीथुः प्रजास्तस्य नियन्तुर्नेमिवृत्तयः ॥” and the next verse, “यस्य
 सुव्यवहाराच्च रक्षणाच्च सुखं प्रजाः । शिथ्यरे विगतोद्वेगाः पितुरङ्कगता इव ॥”
 with Ra., I. 24, “प्रजानां विनयाधानादक्षणाद् भरणादपि । स पिता पितरस्तासां
 केवलं जन्महेतवः ॥”; Sau., II. 7 seems an almost exact but none-
 the-less a puritanic paraphrase of Ra., I. 24. One verse of the
 Raghuvamśa (I. 28) “द्वेष्योऽपि सम्मतः शिष्टस्तस्यार्तस्य यथौषधम् । त्याज्यो
 दुष्टः प्रियोऽप्यासीदङ्गुलीवोरगक्षता ॥” seems to have supplied matter to
 two verses of the Saundarananda, II. 22-23, “(आकृच्छत् वपुषा दृष्टीः
 प्रजानां चन्द्रमा इव) । परस्वं भुवि नामृच्छत् महाविषमिवौ (वो) रगम् ॥ नाकृच्छत्
 विषये तस्य कश्चित् कैश्चित् क्वचित् क्षतः ॥¹ अदृच्छत् तस्य हस्तस्थमार्तैर्भ्यो
 ह्यभयं धनुः ॥” I cannot help thinking that Āśvaghoṣa wrote the
 second verse “नाकृच्छत्” because the other ideas connected with
 उरग (क्षत and आर्त) in Kālidāsa’s verse could not be given a
 place in Sau., II. 22. *This passage ought to decide*
Āśvaghoṣa’s debt to Kālidāsa. The first half of Sau., II. 22,
 may have been suggested by Ra., I. 46, “काप्यभिख्या तयोरासीद्
 व्रजतोः शुद्धवेशयोः । हिमनिर्मुक्तयोर्योगे चित्राचन्द्रमसोरिव ॥” In Sau.,
 II. 53, “सूर्यरश्मिभिरक्लिष्टं पुष्पवर्षं [:] पपात खात् । दिग्ग्वारणकराधूताद् वनाच्चैत्र-
 थादिव ॥” there may be some influence of Ra., II. 60, “तस्मिन् क्षणे
 पालयितुः प्रजानामुत्पश्यतः सिंहनिपातमुग्रम् । अवाङ्मुखस्योपरि पुष्पवृष्टिः पपात
 विद्याधरहस्तमुक्ता ॥” though, of course, one cannot be sure. But
 Sau., II. 54, “दिवि दुन्दुभयो नेदुर्दीव्यतां मरुतामिव । दिदीपेऽत्यधिकं सूर्यः
 शिवश्च पवनो ववौ ॥” has too much in common with Ra., III. 14,
 “दिशः प्रसेदुर्मरुतो ववुः सुखाः प्रदक्षिणार्चिर्हविरग्निराददे । बभूव सर्वं शुभशंसि
 तत्क्षणं भवो हि लोकाम्युदयाय तादृशाम् ॥” to allow of chance coinci-
 dence. In Sau., II. 58, “दीर्घबाहुर्महावह्नाः सिंहांसो वृषभेक्षणः । वपुषाभ्येण
 (यो नाम सुन्दरोपपदं दधे) ॥” is noticeable persistent influence of

¹ The reading कृतः of the paper manuscript conveys no sense and the editor seems justified in preferring the reading of the palm-leaf manuscript.

Kālidāsa, in spite of a conscious effort at variation; cf. Ra., I. 13, “व्यूढोरस्को वृषस्कन्धः शालप्रांशुर्महाभुजः (आत्मकर्मक्षमं देहं चात्रो धर्म इवाश्रितः) ॥” Or, may we think that the variation¹ in Aśvaghōṣa is due to wrong memory?

After Aśvaghōṣa had written two cantos a flow must have set in in his style, and his obligations to Kālidāsa diminish after this. But the seventh verse of canto 4, “तां सुन्दरीं चेन्न लभेत नन्दः सा वा निषेवेत न तं नतभ्रूः । द्वन्द्वं ध्रुवं तद् विकलं न शोभेतान्योन्यहीनाविव रात्रिचन्द्रौ ॥” has a sure genetic connexion with Ra., VII. 14, and Ku., VII. 66, “परस्परेण स्पृहणीयशोभं न चेदिदं द्वन्द्वमयोजयिष्यत् । अस्मिन् द्वये रूपविधानयतः पत्युः प्रजानां वितथोऽभविष्यत् ॥” That Kālidāsa is original is proved by the fact that the idea recurs again and again in his works, so much so, that *it seems to have been connected with the poet's own philosophy of life*. Compare Ra., I. 33, “तस्यामात्मानुरुपायामात्मजन्मसमुत्सुकः etc.,” Ku., I. 18, “... मेनां मुनीनामपि माननीयाम् आत्मानुरूपां विधिनोपयेमे” and Śakuntalā V “त्वमर्हतामप्रसरः स्मृतोऽसि नः शकुन्तला मूर्तिमतीव सत्क्रिया । समानय-स्तुल्यगुणं वधूवरं चिरस्य वाच्यं न गतः प्रजापतिः ॥”² These and other similar passages in Kālidāsa make one infer that the poet had personal experience of the blessings of an *anurūpa* wife. To continue, the first line of Sau., IV. 8, “कन्दर्परत्नोरिव लक्ष्मभूतम् (प्रमोदनान्योरिव नीडभूतम् । प्रहर्षतुष्योरिव पात्रभूतं) द्वन्द्वं सहारंस्त मदान्धभूतम् ॥,” may have been suggested by the verse following Ra., VII. 14 quoted above, viz., “रत्नस्यारौ नूनमिमावभूतां (राज्ञां सहस्रेषु तथाहि बाला । गतेयमात्मप्रतिरूपमेव मनो हि जन्मान्तरसङ्गतिज्ञम् ॥”). Passing on to Sau., IV. 42, “तं गौरवं बुद्धगतं चर्कष्य भार्यानुरागः पुनराचर्कष्य । सोऽनिश्चयान् नापि ययौ न तस्थौ तरंस्तरङ्गेष्विव राजहंसः ॥” may seem to be the model of Kālidāsa's famous “तं वीक्ष्य वेपथुमती सरसा-ङ्गयष्टिर्निचेपणाय पदमुद्धृतमुद्बहन्ती । मार्गाचलव्यतिकराकुलितेव सिन्धुः शैलाधिरा-

¹ Of the উদ্ভোর শিঙি বুদ্ধের ষাড়ে type, as we would put it in Bengali. It is a bull's shoulder and not a lion's that can be an object for comparison. Aśvaghōṣa has made Nanda have the shoulders of a lion and the eyes of a bull! Kālidāsa does not mention the eyes of Dilīpa but his shoulders are likened to those of a bull. Poor Aśvaghōṣa attempted variation but betrayed his plagiarism.

² My friend Pandit Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī Khiste of Benares would probably have me add here Me., II. 54, “... सा भूदेवं क्षणमपि च ते विदुः ता विप्रयोगः.”

जतनया न ययौ न तस्थौ ॥” (Ku., V. 85) as the editor of the Saundarananda probably believes.¹ But when we turn to the Buddhacarita we find Āśvaghoṣa trying to introduce the famous expression “न ययौ न तस्थौ” in an unhappy setting. The tenth canto of the Buddhacarita begins with a description of the Prince’s entrance into Rājagṛha and we have a verse here, “गाम्भीर्यमोजश्च निशम्य तस्य वपुश्च दीप्तं पुरुषानतीत्य । विसिस्मिये तत्र जनस्तदानीं स्थाणुप्रतस्थेव वृषध्वजस्य ॥” (Bu., X. 3). The simile in the last line, to have any meaning, must refer to something well-known. But it is not well known that Śiva was “the cynosure of neighbouring eyes.” I cannot therefore help inferring that Āśvaghoṣa was alluding to Kumārasambhava, VII. 51, “तस्योपकण्ठे घननीलकण्ठः कुतूहलादुन्मुखपौरुषः । स्ववाणचिह्नादवतीर्य मार्गादासन्नभूष्टमियाय देवः ॥,” where Śiva attracts peoples’ eager eyes, because he is a bridegroom coming to marry. But our author is then reminded, by the association of ideas, of Ku., V. 84, “इतो गमिष्याम्यथवेति वादिनी चचाल बाला स्तनभिन्नवल्कला । स्वरूपमास्थाय च तं कृतस्मितः समाललम्बे वृषराजकेतनः ॥” and he cannot resist the temptation of once more imitating the famous expression “न ययौ न तस्थौ” in the following verse of Kumāra (V. 85) and he forcibly brings it in in his next verse, “तं प्रेक्ष्य, योऽन्येन ययौ स तस्थौ यश्चात्र तस्थौ पथि सोऽन्वगच्छत् । द्रुतं ययौ यः सदयं सधीरं यः कश्चिदास्ते स स चोत्पपात ॥.” The fact that न here belongs to another word and the second न had to be substituted by स (:) shows the effort of Āśvaghoṣa. “तं प्रेक्ष्य” in Āśvaghoṣa, it should be noticed, corresponds to Kālidāsa’s “तं वीक्ष्य.” I have no hesitation therefore in concluding that Sau., IV. 42, has been suggested by Ku., V. 85, a conclusion in which I am confirmed by the fact that its last line, “नरंस्तरङ्गेष्विव राजहंसः” is rather inappropriate: the swan when *swimming* through the waves does not seem stationary. *This passage is thus decisive in showing Āśvaghoṣa’s posteriority.*

Any further resemblance with the Raghuvamśa I have not noted yet, but I suspect that a detailed comparison may reveal

¹ Preface, p. v.

the continued influence of Kālidāsa over the Saundarananda. Its sixth canto, for example, describing the laments of Sundarī, may have been influenced by the fourth canto (*Rativilāpa*) of the Kumārasambhava. In spite of characteristic differences, due to Kāma's death in the Kumārasambhava and Nanda's accepting of the order in the Saundarananda, we have some agreement in their structure. Rati laments by herself, then Vasanta comes, her sorrow is increased and she wants to die *Satī* with Kāma's remains ; but a voice from the sky commands her to desist from her purpose and assures her of a reunion with her lord. In the Saundarananda, Sundarī too laments by herself, and when she is joined by another woman, she thinks her husband is coming, but she realises her mistake and her sorrow is increased, particularly when she learns her husband's fate. A sensible attendant now admonishes her that as a queen of the Ikṣvāku family she should exult over her husband's retirement to the forest (“इह्वाकुवंशे ह्यभिकाङ्क्षितानि दायद्यभूतानि तपोवनानि” VI. 39) and should not be sorrowful (“वीतस्पृहो धर्ममनुप्रपन्नः किं विह्वलो रोदिषि हर्षकाले” VI. 43).¹ This makes the parallelism complete, so far as the circumstances could permit. But (false) hope of reunion with Nanda (which is really impossible) was also thought necessary by our author to be given to Sundarī by another maid (verses 45—48). Does not this indicate that Aśvaghōṣa wrote after Kālidāsa? The thought in Ku., IV. 19, “विबुधैरसि यस्य दारुणैरसमाप्ते परिकर्मणि स्मृतः । तमिमं कुरु दक्षिणेतरं चरणं निर्मितरागमेहि मे ॥” could be taken to have

¹ I cannot help reading in Sau., VI. 39, 40 (राजर्षिर्वध्वास्तव नातृरूपे धर्माश्रिते भर्तारि जातु कोपः । इह्वाकुवंशे ह्यभिकाङ्क्षितानि दायद्यभूतानि तपोवनानि ॥ प्रायेण सौमित्रा यत्रिः सुतानां शत्रुपर्यभाणां विदिताः स्त्रियस्ते । तपोवनानीय गृहाणि यानां राक्षसव्रतं कामयदाश्रितानाम् ॥) an influence of and an improvement on Ra., III. 70 (अथ स विषयव्यावृत्तात्मा यथाविधि सुमित्रे वृषतिककुदं दृष्ट्वा ध्रुवे सितातपवारणम् । मुनिवपनतरुच्छायां देव्या तया सह गिश्चिरे गलितवयराभिधवाकूणादिदं हि कुलव्रतम् ॥). The idea of heritage in Aśvaghōṣa is probably suggested by “सूत्रे...दृष्ट्वा...सितातपवारणम्” in Kālidāsa and Sau., VI. 40 probably attempts an alteration from “मुनिवपनतरुच्छायां देव्या तया सह गिश्चिरे,” necessitated by the difference of the situation. Kālidāsa repeats the idea of Ikṣvākus retiring to the forest in Ra., VIII. 11, etc.

been suggested by canto IV of the *Saundarananda* (particularly verse 34, “*नाहं यियासेर्गुह्यदर्शनार्थम् अर्हामि कर्तुं तव धर्मपीडाम् । गच्छायुष्यत्रैहि च शीघ्रमेव विशेषको यावदयं न शुष्कः ॥*”), because Kālidāsa has not informed us ere this of Kāma’s having been called away from Rati’s presence only after he had painted her right foot.¹ But that conclusion is barred by the exact nature of the parallelism between Ku., IV. and Sau. VI, indicated above, and by the two or three decisive cases of Aśvaghōṣa’s obligation to Kālidāsa mentioned already. I therefore suppose that Aśvaghōṣa himself derived some suggestions from Ku., IV. 19, for his own story and he made his hero leave his beloved when she had just painted her cheeks.² Similarly there may be some influence of Raghuvamśa, canto VIII (*Aja-vilāpa*), over the seventh canto of the *Saundarananda*, where Nānda laments over his separation from Sundarī.

In the *Saundarananda*, Aśvaghōṣa speaks of some princes, believed to have been descended from the Ikṣvākus, and it is natural that he should turn to the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa which describes the early Ikṣvākus. My studies have led me to the conclusion that Aśvaghōṣa had before him the *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa, when he next took up the *Buddhacarita*. The reason is not far to seek : both Śiva and Buddha are *māra-jits*, i.e., conquerors of Māra, with this difference that Aśvaghōṣa’s hero conquers Māra for ever and does not come under him again as Śiva does—we have therefore a simile here of the अधिक

¹ Nor does Kālidāsa tell us in the third Act of *Śakuntalā* of the incident about the deer (*Dirghāpāṅga*) *Śakuntalā* refers to in the fifth. He was the least prosaic of poets.

² Kālidāsa makes Kāma dye the feet of Rati with lac, but our puritanic author would improve by making Sundarī paint her cheeks and that herself. But is it an improvement? Tradition has it that when Jayadeva had written, “*स्वर्णरत्नखण्डनं नम गिरसि खण्डनं देहि पदपद्मवन्दनम्*” his piety began to torment him and the poor Brahmin felt constrained to pen through the line “*देहि पदपद्मवन्दनम्*” but the Lord, so the story says, Himself came in Jayadeva’s absence and re-wrote what Jayadeva wanted to remove. But, of course, these are ideas of a different plain of thought.

class.¹ Though Āśvaghoṣa mostly used the Kumārasambhava when writing the Buddhacarita, the Raghuvamśa was not altogether forgotten. I give below my reasons for this view.

We have references to the Kailāsa in verses 3 and 21 of the first canto of the Buddhacarita in not very happy settings and they seem to suggest that Kailāsa has been unnecessarily mentioned only because the author was thinking of the Lord of Kailāsa, described in the Kumārasambhava; the second half of v. 21, “सर्वत्र भान्तोऽपि हि चन्द्रपादा भजन्ति कैलासगिरौ विशेषम्” is particularly suggestive. But these references are not decisive and I do not want to press them. But verse 11 of the same canto, “भुजेन यस्याभिहताः पतन्तो द्विषद्विषेन्द्राः समराङ्गणेषु। उद्वान्तमुक्ताप्रकरैः शिरोभिर्भक्त्येव पुष्पाञ्जलिभिः प्रणमुः॥” certainly suggests Kumārasambhava, I. 6, “पदं तुषारस्रुतिधौतरक्तं यस्मिन्नद्वयपि हतद्विपानाम्। विदन्ति मार्गं नखरन्ध्रमुक्तैर्मुक्ताफलैः केसरिणां किराताः॥” The fact that Kālidāsa speaks of actual elephants and actual *gajamotis* and Āśvaghoṣa figuratively of enemy-kings as elephants and of pearls in their crests as *gajamotis* conclusively proves that Āśvaghoṣa was influenced by Kālidāsa and not the other way. *Udvānta* in Āśvaghoṣa is inappropriate and seems to be simply due to Kālidāsa's *muktair*. [In verse 22, “मायापि तं कुचिगतं दधाना विद्युद्विलासं जलदावलीव। दानाभिवर्षैः परितो जनानां दारिद्र्यतापं शमयाञ्चकार॥” we may have some influence of Ra., III. 12, “कुमारभृत्याकुशलैरनुष्ठिते भिषग्भिरासैरथ गर्भभर्मेणि। पतिः प्रतीतः प्रसवोन्मुखीं प्रियां ददर्श काले दिवमग्नितामिव॥” and, may be, also of Ra., I. 18 c, d., “सहस्रगुणमुत्स्रष्टुमादत्ते हिरसं रविः”]. It is true

¹ I am glad to quote the following from Mr. Dhanapati Banerji : “Asva Ghosha has another fling at Kalidasa in a different place. Siva succumbed to the influences of Mara or Madana. But Buddha could not be subdued, and Mara wonders at the fact. This is certainly an improvement according to Asva Ghosha. It seems that Bharavi took his revenge on Asva Ghosha, for in his epic, not only the tempters fail to overcome Arjuna but are themselves overcome. These elaborations, in my opinion, settle the chronology of the poets beyond any doubt” (Q. J. M. S., X, p. 88). The story in the *Sūtrālatkāra* of Āśvaghoṣa (pp. 263—73) about the tussle of Upagupta with Māra, preserved in the *Divyavadāna* shows the influence of the Kumārasambhava, in that Buddha is there said to have tolerated Māra.

that there is nothing in the Tibetan and Chinese versions of the Buddhacarita corresponding to the first 24 verses of Cowell's Sanskrit text,¹ but we should not conclude on that account the late date of this portion, for the Chinese version is throughout much shorter than the Sanskrit text and leaves out a good deal of important matter; the same may be also true of the Tibetan rendering.² Verses 25 and 26 of the Buddhacarita, "ततः प्रसन्नश्च बभूव पुण्यस्तस्याश्च देव्या व्रतसंस्कृतायाः । पार्षात्सुतो लोकहिताय जज्ञे निर्वेदनं चैव निरामयं च ॥ प्रातः पयोदादिव तिग्मभासुः समुद्भवन् सोऽपि च मातृकुक्षेः । स्फुरन्मयूखैर्विहितान्धकारैश्चकार लोकं कनकावदातम् ॥," have a strong resemblance with Ku., I. 23-24, "प्रसन्नदिक् पांसुविविक्तवातं शङ्खस्वनानन्तरपुष्पवृष्टि । शरीरिणां स्थावरजङ्गमानां सुखाय तज्जन्मदिनं बभूव ॥ तथा दुहित्रा सुतरां सवित्री स्फुरत्प्रभामण्डलया चकासे । विदूरभूर्मिनवमेघशब्दादुद्भिन्नया रत्नशलाकयेव ॥" and Ra., III. 14, "दिशः प्रसेदुर्मस्तो ववुः सुखाः प्रदक्षिणाचिह्नविरभिराददे । बभूव सर्वं शुभशंसितत्त्वं भवोहि लोकाभ्युदयाय तादृशाम् ॥"; of course, who is the borrower, Āśvaghoṣa or Kālidāsa, cannot be decided in the present case. We have another resemblance between Bu., I. 28, "सुरप्रधानैः परिधायमाणो देहांशुजालैरनुरञ्जयंस्तान् । सन्ध्याभ्रजालोऽपि संनिविष्टं नवोदुराजं विजिगाय लक्ष्म्या," and Ku., I. 25, "दिने दिने सा परिवर्धमाना लब्धोदया चान्द्रमसीव लेखा । पुपोऽप्यलावण्यमयान् विशेषान् ज्योत्स्नान्तराणीव कलान्तराणि ॥" In Bu., I. 32, "स हि स्वगात्रप्रभयोज्ज्वलन्त्या दीपप्रभां भास्करवन्मुषोऽपि । महार्हजाम्बूनदचारुवर्णो विद्योतयामास दिशश्च सर्वाः ॥," we have the influence of Ra., III. 15, "अरिष्टशय्यां परितो विसारिणा सुजन्मनस्तस्य निजेन तेजसा । निशीथदीपाः सहसा हतत्विषो बभूवुरालेख्यसमर्पिता इव ॥" and Ra., X. 68, "रघुवंशप्रदीपेन तेनाप्रतिमतेजसा । रत्नागृहगता दीपाः प्रत्यादिष्टा इवाभवन् ॥," both suggested probably by "प्रभामहत्या शिखयेव दीपस्त्रिमार्गयेव त्रिदिवस्य मार्गः । संस्कारवत्येव गिरा मनीषी तथा स पूतश्च विभूषितश्च ॥," of the Kumārasambhava (I. 28); in "पाण्डुरमातपत्रम्" of Bu., I. 37 c too we may have the influence of "शशिप्रभं क्षत्रम्" of Ra., III. 16 d. The fortieth verse of Buddhacarita, Canto I, "यस्मिन् प्रसूते

¹ Cowell's Buddhacarita, p. 4, n. 1.

² I tried to secure some information about the Tibetan translation but I did not succeed.

गिरिराजकीला वाताहता नौरिव भूश्चाल । सचन्दना चोत्पलपद्मगर्भा पपात
 वृष्टिर्गगनादनन्नात् ॥,” has two verbal agreements (in the same order)
 with Kumārasambhava, I. 46, “प्रवातनीलोत्पलनिर्विशेषमधीरविप्रेक्षि-
 तमायताक्ष्या । तथा गृहीतं नु मृगाङ्गनाभ्यस्ततो गृहीतं नु मृगाङ्गनाभिः ॥” and
 agreement in thought with Ku., I. 23 b, “शङ्कस्वनानन्तरपुष्पवृष्टिः.” It
 should be noted that in Āśvaghoṣa’s verse we have an unusual
 conceit, the coming down of lilies and lotuses, both water flowers,
 from the heavens, which could have been suggested only by the
 उत्पल of Kumārasambhava, I. 46, coming after वात in the same
 verse and utilised by our author in the second line. When
 Āśvaghoṣa had written the first half of the verse, his own words
 गिरिराज and वात probably suggested to him the beautiful verse
 in Kumārasambhava, (I. 46) describing the eyes of Girirāja’s
 daughter and also the one (I. 23) describing the effects of her
 birth. So much was our author’s imagination haunted by the
 beautiful verses of the popular poet that in the next verse (Bu., I.
 41), “वाता ववुः स्पर्शसुखा मनोज्ञा दिव्यानि वासांस्यवपातयन्तः । सूर्यः स
 एवाभ्यधिकं चकाशे जज्वाल सोम्यार्चिरनीरितोऽग्निः ॥,” he put in
 some of the unutilised ideas of Ra., III. 14, “दिशः प्रसेदुर्मरुतो ववुः
 सुखाः प्रदक्षिणाचिर्हविरग्निराददे । बभूव सर्वं शुभशंसि तत्क्षणं भवो हि
 लोकाभ्युदयाय तादृशम् ॥.” The following verses of the Buddhacarita
 are but continuations of these ideas.

We also notice in Bu., I. 45, क्वचित् कणत्सूर्यमृदङ्गगीतैर्वीणा-
 मुकुन्दामुरजादिभिश्च । स्त्रीणां चलत्कुण्डलभूषितानां विराजितं चोभयपार्श्वतस्तत् ॥,”
 some verbal agreement with a verse in Kumārasambhava,
 (“किञ्चित्क्वणत्किन्नरमधुवास” I. 54), and agreement in thought
 and language with Raghuvamśa, III. 19, “सुखश्रवा मङ्गलतूर्यनिस्वनाः
 प्रमोदनृत्यैः सह वारयोषिताम् । न केवलं सन्ननि मागधीपतेः पथि व्यजृम्भन्त
 दिवौकसामपि ॥.” It is possible that the introduction of Āsita
 Devala’s prophecy of the Prince’s future greatness was suggested
 by Nārada’s prophecy of Pārvatī’s marriage with Śiva in the
 Kumārasambhava ; but of course one cannot be sure for the story
 recurs in the other biographies of the Buddha. Āśvaghoṣa’s
 borrowing is, however, rendered possible by the fact that the
 other biographies of Buddha are not earlier than Āśvaghoṣa’s

Buddhacarita.¹ In any case, some influence of Kumāra-sambhava, I. 50, “तां नारदः कामचरः कदाचित्कन्यां किल प्रेक्ष्य पितुः समीपे । समादिदेशैकवधू भवित्रीं प्रेम्णा शरीराद्धरां हरस्य ॥,” over the concluding verse of the Asita Devala episode, “अथ मुनिरसितो निवेद्य तत्त्वं सुतनियतं सुतविक्रवाय राज्ञे । सबहुमानमुदीक्ष्यमाणरूपः पवनपथेन यथागतं जगाम ॥” (Bu., I. 85), where Asita is made to fly through space like Nārada (a real denizen of the celestial regions) is just possible.² The passage in the Buddhacarita (I. 46—51) culminating in “तस्मात्प्रमाणं न वयो न कालः कश्चित्कचिच्छैष्यमुपैति लोके । राज्ञामृषीणां च दितानि तानि कृतानि पुत्रैरकृतानि पूर्वैः ॥” may have been suggested by “पुराणमित्येव न साधु सर्वं न चापि काव्यं नवमित्यवधम्” in the Prologue of the Mālavikāgnimitra; but I am not sure on the point. Again in Bu., I. 70, “अप्यक्षयं मे यशसो निधानं कश्चिद्भुवो मे कुलहस्तसारः । अपि प्रयास्यामि सुखं परत्र सुप्तेऽपि पुत्रेऽनिमित्तैकचक्षुः”, we notice some influence of Raghuvamśa, III. 17, “निवातपद्मस्तिमितेन चक्षुषा नृपस्य कान्तं पिबतः सुताननम् । महोदधेः पूर इवेन्दुदर्शनाद् गुरुः प्रहर्षः प्रबभूव नात्मनि ॥ ;” and in Bu., I. 87, “नरपतिरपि पुत्रजन्मतुष्टो विषयमतानि विमुच्य बन्धनानि । कुलसदृशमचीकरघषावप्रियतनयं तनयस्य जातकर्म ॥,” an improvement over Ra., III. 20, “न संयतस्तस्य बभूव रक्षितुर्विसर्जयेद्यं सुतजन्महर्षितः । ऋणाभिधानात् स्वयमेव केवलं तदा पितृणां

¹ The Lalitavistara, despite the view of some to the contrary, must be placed after the Buddhacarita, the Mahāvastu contains much that is very late and the Pāli Nidāna Kathā probably belongs to the fifth century A.D.

² “अथ खन्वसितो महर्षिः सार्धं नरदत्तेन भागिनेयेन राजहंस इव गगनतलाद्भ्युगम्य मनुस्मृत्य येन कपिलवस्तु महानगरं तेनोपसङ्क्रान्तुपसंक्रम्य ऋद्धिं प्रतिभङ्ग्य पद्भ्यामेव कपिलवस्तु महानगरं प्रविश्य, etc.” in the Lalitavistara (Lefmann's edition, p. 102) proves nothing, for that work is later than the Buddhacarita and has the additional defect of belonging to the Lokottaravāda school so notorious for its exaggerations. By “कामचरः” Kālidāsa may have meant simply ‘passing at his pleasure by that way,’ (पदच्छया चरन्) and not ‘able to roam anywhere at will,’ but there was nothing to prevent Aśvaghoṣa from understanding a reference to the celestial flight of Nārada which Kālidāsa certainly believed in. Asita Devala was a mortal, and power to fly would be attributed to him only in very late times, and this makes me infer the influence of Kālidāsa in Aśvaghoṣa's story. Post-Aśvaghoṣean writers would but follow him, adding their own elaborations.

मुमुचे स बन्धनात् ॥.”¹ Lastly the ninety-third verse of Buddhacarita, canto I, “भवनमथ विगाह्य शाक्यराजो भव इव षण्मुख-जन्मना प्रतीतः । इदमिदमिति हर्षपूर्णवक्त्रो बहुविधपुष्टियशस्करं व्यधत् ॥,” shows Āśvaghōṣa’s acquaintance with the Kumārasambhava story and with the text of Ra., III. 23, “उमावृषाङ्गौ शरजन्मना यथा यथा जयन्तेन शचीपुरन्दरौ । तथा नृपः सा च सुतेन मागधी ननन्दतुल्यसदृशेन तत्समौ ॥.”

After the first canto of the Buddhacarita, the influence of the Kumārasambhava and the Raghuvamśa diminishes, but it does not disappear altogether. In Bu., II. 26, “यशोधरां नाम यशोविशालां तुल्याभिधानां श्रियमाजुहाव,” we may read some influence of Ku., I. 18, “.....मेनां मुनीनामपि माननीयामात्मानुरूपां विधिनापयेमे” and Ra., I. 33 “तस्यामात्मानुरूपायाम्.....,” and in the following verse, “अथापरं भूमिपतेः प्रियोऽयं सनत्कुमारप्रतिमः कुमारः । सार्धं तथा शाक्यनरेन्द्रवध्वा शच्या सहस्राक्ष इवाभिरेमे ॥” the influence of the verse following Ku., I. 18, viz., “कालक्रमेणाथ तयोः प्रवृत्ते स्वरूपयोग्ये सुरतप्रसङ्गे” Does not Āśvaghōṣa remind us of his deep acquaintance with the Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa, in Bu., II. 30, “कलैर्हि चामीकरवद्वक्त्रैर्नारीकराग्राभिहतैर्मृदङ्गैः । वराप्सरोनृत्यसमैश्च नृत्यैः कैलासवत् तद्भवनं रराज ॥” ? But the two following verses of the Buddhist monk, “वाग्भिः कलाभिर्ललितैश्च हारैर्मदैः सखेलैर्मधुरैश्च हासैः । तं तत्र नार्यो रमयांबभूवुर्भ्रूवञ्चितैरर्धनिरीक्षितैश्च ॥ ततश्च कामाश्रयपण्डिताभिः स्त्रीभिर्गृहीतो रतिकर्कशाभिः । विमानपृष्ठान्न महीं जगाम विमानपृष्ठादिव पुण्यकर्मा ॥”, have certainly drawn inspiration from the nineteenth canto of the Raghuvamśa, particularly from Verses 16 and 17, “तस्य सावरणदृष्टमन्धयः काम्यवस्तुषु नवेषु सज्जिनः । वल्लभाभिरुपसृत्य चक्रिरे सामिभुक्तविषयाः समागमाः ॥ अङ्गुलीकिसलयाग्रतर्जनं भ्रूविभङ्गकुटिलञ्च वीक्षितम् । मेखलाभिरसकृच्च बन्धनं वञ्चयन् प्रणयिनीरवाप सः ॥”; “विमानपृष्ठान्न महीं जगाम” is certainly due to Ra., XIX. 7.

¹ Kings release prisoners on joyous occasions ; cf. Mālavikāgnimitra, Act V. The successful monarch Dilīpa (Ra., I 17, 27), had no prisoner in his realm whom he could release ; he therefore had to console himself with the idea that he was himself released from ‘the debt to the ancestors.’ But the monk Āśvaghōṣa finds room for *Bandhana-Mocana*—he makes his Śuddhodana free himself from the bonds of his own passion.

Sufficient has been said already by myself and also by my predecessors, Mr. Dhanapati Banerji, Mr. S. Ray and Mr. K. G. Sankara, about the debt of Āśvaghoṣa to Kālidāsa for Bu., III. 13—24, and I need not add anything more here. Bu., IV. 3, “तस्थुश्च परिवार्यै न मनमथाक्षिसचेतसः। निश्चलैः प्रीतिविकचैः पिबन्त्य इव लोचनैः।” again shows the influence of Kālidāsa ; c.f. Ku., VII. 64, “तमेकदृश्यं नयनैः पिबन्त्यो नार्यो न जग्मुर्विषयान्तराणि । तथाहि शेषेन्द्रियवृत्तिरासां सर्वात्मना चतुरिव प्रविष्टा ॥” and Ra., VII. 12, “ता राघवं दृष्टिभिरापिबन्त्यो नार्यो न...प्रविष्टा ॥” Bu., IV. 4, “तं हिता मेनिरै नार्यः कामो विग्रहवानिति । शोभितं लक्ष्यैर्दीप्तैः सहजैर्भूर्पणैरिव ॥,” may have been influenced by Ra., VII. 15, “रतिस्मरौ नूनमिमावभूताम् etc.”. Bu., IV. 7, “एवं ता दृष्टिमात्रेण नार्यो ददृशुरेव तम् । न व्याजदुर्न जहसुः प्रभावेणास्य यन्त्रिताः ॥” may have been suggested by Ku., III. 51, “स्मरस्तथाभूतमयुग्मनेत्रं पश्यन्नदूरान्मनसाप्यष्टयम् । नालक्ष्यत्साध्वससन्नहस्तः स्वस्तं शरं चापमपि स्वहस्तात् ॥” and Bu., IV. 24-25, “इत्युदायिवचः श्रुत्वा ता विद्धा इव योषितः । समारुरुहुरात्मानं कुमारग्रहणं प्रति ॥ ता भ्रूभिः प्रेक्षितैर्भावैर्हसितैर्ललितैर्गतैः चक्रुराक्षेपिकाश्चेष्टा भीतभीता इवाङ्गनाः ॥,” by Ku., III. 52, “निर्वाणभूयिष्ठमथास्य वीर्यं सन्धुक्ष्यन्तीव वपुर्गुणेन । अनुप्रयाता वनदेवताभ्याम् अदृश्यत स्थावरराजकन्या ॥”. Verses 27—53 of this canto, which describe the various attempts of the damsels to capture the Prince’s heart, show a thorough influence of the nineteenth canto of the Raghuvamśa, but I do not like to bring out the parallelisms here for obvious reasons. Let readers, who may hesitate to accept my statement, compare the two texts and draw their own conclusions, and I doubt not that they will come to my view. I have already spoken of the decisive character of Āśvaghoṣa’s obligation to Kālidāsa for Bu., X. 4. The twenty-third verse of the same canto, “आदित्यपूर्वं विपुलं कुलं ते नवं वयो दीप्तमिदं वपुश्च । कस्मादियं ते मतिरक्रमेण भैक्षक एवाभिरता न राज्ये ॥,” has an obvious connexion with Ra., II. 47, “एकातपत्रं जगतः प्रभुत्वं नवं वयः कान्तमिदं वपुश्च । अल्पस्य हेतोर्बहु हातुमिच्छन् विचारमूढः प्रतिभासि मे त्वम् ॥” Āśvaghoṣa altered “एकातपत्रं जगतः प्रभुत्वम्” because Siddhārtha never ascended the throne and “आदित्य” in the altered first line suggested the change of “कान्तम्” in the second to “दीप्तम्”. We notice in Bu., XII. 117, “ततः स पर्यङ्कमकम्प्यमुत्तमं बबन्ध

सुसोरगभोगपिण्डितम् भिनशि तावद्भुवि नैतदासनं न यामि तावत् (यावत् ?) कृतकृत्यतामिति ॥," the influence of Ku., III. 45, 46, "पर्यङ्कबन्धस्थिरपूर्व-कायमृन्वायतं संनमितोभयांसम् । उत्तानपाणिद्वयसंनिवेशात्प्रफुल्लराजीवमिवाङ्गमध्ये ॥ भुजङ्गमोन्नद्धजटाकलापं कर्णावसक्तद्विगुणाक्षसूत्रम् । कण्ठप्रभासङ्गविशेषनीलां कृष्णः श्वचं ग्रन्थिमतीं दधानम् ॥." We have "पर्यङ्कं बन्ध" in the first line of Aśvaghoṣa corresponding to पर्यङ्कबन्ध of Kālidāsa's first verse. But Buddha could have no connexion with a real snake, as his predecessor Śiva is said to have had in Kālidāsa's second verse; we are therefore told in Aśvaghoṣa's second line that Buddha's body was coiled so closely as the hood of the sleeping serpent—a rather odd concept ! The last verse of the canto, "ततो ययुर्मुदमतुलां दिवौकसे ववासिरे न मृगगणा न पक्षिणः । न सस्वर्गनन्तरवोऽनिलाहताः कृतासनं भगवति निश्चलात्मनि", again shows the influence of the Kumārasambhava. The first line says that the gods were pleased and we would expect to hear in the second and third lines of the joy of nature as well; but we find instead the whole nature struck dumb. Does not this suggest the influence of those beautiful verses in the Kumārasambhava (III. 41-42), "लतागृहद्वारगतोऽथ नन्दी वामप्रकोष्ठार्पितहेमवेत्रः मुखापितैकाङ्गलिसंज्ञयैव मा चापलायेति गणान्वयनैवीत् ॥ निष्कम्पवृत्तं निभृतद्विरेफं मूकाण्डजं शान्त-मृगप्रचारम् । तच्छासनात्काननमेव सर्वं चित्रार्पितारम्भमिवावतस्थे ॥ ?" The next canto of the Buddhacarita describes the would-be Buddha's conquest of Māra. Professor Cowell¹ has suggested that Kālidāsa was indebted to this portion of the Buddhacarita for some ideas in his Kumārasambhava, canto III. What has been said already will make this impossible. But Aśvaghoṣa's indebtedness to Kālidāsa is also not certain; the two stories are different. One verse, however, "शैलेन्द्रपुत्रीं प्रति येन विद्धो देवोऽपि शम्भुश्चलितो बभूव । न चिन्तयत्येष तमेव बाणं किं स्यादचित्तो न शरः स एषः ॥" (Bu., XIII. 16), clearly shows that the author was thinking of the Kumārasambhava; for the story of Kāma's hitting at Śiva in the presence of Pārvatī is certainly Kālidāsa's own invention. Bu., XIII. 30, 31, "महीभृतो धर्मपराश्च नागा महामुनेर्विघ्नममृष्यमाणाः । मारं प्रति क्रोधविवृत्तनेत्रा निःशश्चसुरश्चैव जजृम्भरे च ॥ शुद्धाधिवासा विबुधर्षयस्तु

¹ Buddhacarita, Preface, xii.

सद्धर्मसिद्धयर्थमिव प्रवृत्ताः । मारेऽनुकम्पा मनसा प्रचक्षुर्विशगभावात् न रोष-
मीयुः ॥” may show some influence of Ku. III. 71-72, “तपः-
परामर्शविवृद्धमन्योर्भूभङ्गदुष्प्रेक्ष्यमुखस्य तस्य । स्फुरन्नुदधिः सहसा तृतीयादक्ष्यः
कुशानुः किल निष्पपात ॥ क्रोधं प्रभो संहर संहरेति यावद्गिरः खे मरुतां चरन्ति ।
तावत्स वह्निर्भवेनेत्रजन्मा भस्मावशेषं मदनं चकार ॥” Śiva burns Madana
himself. But the passionless Buddha cannot do that; he sits
quiet (v. 33). It is others whose eyes burn with rage (v. 30).
The “अनुकम्पा” (‘compassion’) of the Devarṣis (v. 31) is
inappropriate in the Buddhacarita and can be explained only as
a reflection of the compassionate exclamation of the Maruts in
Kumārasambhava III. 72. Another verse (65) of Buddha-
carita, Canto. XIII, “जमाशिफो धैर्यविगाढमूलश्चरित्रगुण्यः स्मृतिबुद्धिशालः ।
ज्ञानद्रुमो धर्मफलप्रदाता नेत्पाटनं ह्यर्हति वर्धमानः ॥” shows obvious
influence of Ku., II. 55, “इतः स दैत्यः प्राप्तश्रीर्नेत एवार्हति क्षयम् । विष-
वृक्षोऽपि संवर्धय स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतम् ॥”

I have not attempted comparison of the fourteenth and
following chapters of Cowell’s Buddhacarita, because they are
nineteenth century compositions. Beal’s translation of chapters
14—28 of the Chinese version also seems unsuited for compari-
son on account of its extreme brevity and the many deviations
from the original added to the usual shortcomings of a
translation of a translation. I must, therefore, take leave of the
Buddhacarita, only reminding the readers that the author
again and again used the Kumārasambhava, with whose story
his had something in common, and that he could not shake
off from his memory the Raghuvamśa utilised already for his
maiden *Kāvya*, the *Saundarananda*.

Before taking leave of the poems of Aśvaghoṣa I must
once again draw the attention of my readers to the nature of
the above agreements. Some people may say¹ that they only
prove that of Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa one borrowed from the
other but the borrower may well be the former and not the
latter. But a little reflection ought to convince one that the

* ¹ As my friend Mr. Beni Prasad of our History Department
said when he read some part of this paper in proof.

resemblances conclusively prove Aśvaghoṣa's indebtedness. Apart from the few decisive cases mentioned already, the extent and the limit of his agreements with Kālidāsa show that he came later. It is his first *Kāvya*, the *Saundarananda*, which agrees verbally with Kālidāsa more—and that chiefly at the beginning—than the later work, the *Buddhacarita*. The *Raghuvamśa*, the work of Kālidāsa which the *Saundarananda* resembles so much, is, on the other hand, the maturest production of Kālidāsa, at least from among his poems. Would a poet in the fulness of his powers turn to another writer for drawing inspiration when he could write so long without help? A writer who never before tried his hands at poetry would rather begin with a good model but would discard it when his own powers would begin to develop. When writing the *Buddhacarita*, Aśvaghoṣa is more original and the points of verbal contact with Kālidāsa are much fewer now. We should notice that though the agreement in subject-matter makes him occasionally draw inspiration from the *Kumārasambhava*, he has not forgotten the *Raghuvamśa* which he has already utilised so well. Lastly, the still later *Sūtrālaṅkāra*, to judge from the three passages preserved in the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 357-64, 382-4, 430-3),¹ is a first rate work with very little obligation to Kālidāsa. Professor Keith has said² about Kālidāsa that he was a poet “not so much of inspiration and genius as of perfect accomplishment based on a high degree of talent.” But in my humble opinion, and I hope in the opinion of all other Indian students of Kālidāsa, the remark is not

¹ The third passage, containing a touching story of Aśoka's liberality towards the Saṅgha may have been influenced by the story of Raghu's liberality in Ra., V.

My informations about the *Sūtrālaṅkāra* are drawn from Huber's preface and French version, translated for me by my friend Mr. Priyaranjan Sen of the Calcutta University, from Nariman's *Sanskrit Buddhism* and from Winternitz, *Geschichte d. ind. Literatur*.

² *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 33.

just.¹ It is our Aśvaghōṣa who can be thus described. Anybody who has ever versified with effort in his school boy days, with models constantly before him, will appreciate the force of my arguments about Aśvaghōṣa's indebtedness.

Aśvaghōṣa finding that he could write well and catch the hearts of people through his *Kāvya*s tried his hands at the other important class of literature, the drama, and we have the Śāriputraprakaraṇa. It is much to be regretted that a complete manuscript of the drama could not be discovered.² But the other fragmentary drama³ found with its manuscript and most probably hailing from the same author⁴ gives us an unexpected light on the condition of the Sanskrit Drama in this period. Their perusal shows us that the regular form of the classical drama had been established by this time.⁵ We have here two Buddhist dramas, but even here the Vidyāśaka appears, and strangely enough, the hetaera too. This proves that Aśvaghōṣa had enough classical models to go by, a conclusion already made probable by the many references to dramatic works in the Mahābhāṣya of the second century before Christ.⁶ After carefully going through the fragments published by Professor Lüders I came to the conclusion that Aśvaghōṣa had before him the Mṛcchakaṭika of Śūdraka. Professor Keith has

¹ I have here the full support of my uncle Rai Bahadur Bipin Bihari Mukherji, a great lover of Kālidāsa.

² Professor Lüders has given us an account of the fragments with such extracts as could be made out in the *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* for 1911, pp. 388—409.

³ Printed in Lüders' *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen* (Berlin, 1911), pp. 67—89 and *Sitzungsberichte d. K. P. Akademie*, Berlin, 1911, pp. 409—11. The short allegorical drama in the *Bruchstücke*, pp. 66-67, is left out of consideration here.

⁴ Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 83 (end).

⁵ See *ibid.*, pp. 80—90.

⁶ As also by the now discovered reference to the *Vāsavadattā-Nāṭyadhārā* of Subandhu, contemporary of Candragupta, and Bindusāra in Abhinavagupta's commentary on the *Nāṭya Śāstra* (Rangaswāmī Saraswati in the *Proceedings of the Calcutta Oriental Conference*, pp. 203—213, and *I.H.Q.*, I. pp. 261—264).

already¹ noticed some resemblances with that drama but my study adds a genetic connexion, the borrower being Aśvaghoṣa in this case as well. I have no space here for a full discussion of the question and I reserve that for a separate paper. This Mṛcchakaṭika has been believed by many people to be an early drama and it may belong to the first century before or after Christ, for all that is known.² The tradition contained in the Avantisundarikathā of Daṇḍin (7th century A.D.) makes its author Śūdraka a contemporary of the Andhra King Svāti.³ This Andhra prince may have been either Meghasvāti or Svāti or Skandasyāti, and Śūdraka should therefore be placed somewhere in the first century B.C., or in the beginning of the following century, and would be anterior to Aśvaghoṣa. The Mṛcchakaṭika seems to me to be the work of some court poet (or poets⁴), as the Ratnāvalī, the Nāgānanda and the Priyadarśikā are by Harṣavardhana's court poets.⁵

¹ Sanskrit Drama, pp. 84-5.

² My Professor the late Dr. T. K. Laddu used to point out some influence of Kālidāsa and I believe he was right.

³ M. R. Kavi in Proceedings of the Calcutta Oriental Conference, p. 197. See Avantisundarī-Kathāśāra, Ch. IV, vv. 175 ff. The tradition is repeated in some other works; see Keith, Sanskrit Drama, p. 129.

⁴ If “ती शूद्रककथाकारो रम्यो रानिलमीलितो । काव्यं ययोर्द्वयोरासीदर्धनारीश्वरोपमम् ॥” refers to the composition of the Mṛcchakaṭikam. “शूद्रकेणासकृज्जित्वा स्वच्छया खड्गधारया । जगद्भूयोऽभ्यवष्टब्धं वाचा स्वचरितार्थया ॥” of the Avantisundarīkathā (pp. 1-2) makes the incidents of the Mṛcchakaṭikam resemble some incidents in Śūdraka's own life.

⁵ Cf. “श्रीहर्षादेरिव आचकादीनां जनम्” in Kāvyaaprakāśa, I. 2 (see Keith, Sanskrit Drama, p. 171). Rudradāman may have been another king who laid claim to, or was allowed to claim the writings of, his court poets (Junnagarh Rock Inscription, l. 14). This interesting inscription shows, as the Head of my Department, Professor Dr. Acārya, emphasises, the full development of Sanskrit literary form by that time. Kālidāsa may easily be placed before it. [The usual neglect of the early Sanskrit inscriptions by our students of Sanskrit literature is much to be regretted.]

Some part of the prologue may have been added after the king's death. "शूद्रकोऽग्निं प्रविष्टः" may be simply an euphemism for 'Śūdraka died,' but if it must mean suicide, I may cite the parallel of a similar incident of the first century B.C., mentioned by Strabo; among the persons and things sent by King Pandion to Augustus was a gymnosophist who immolated himself in prosperity in Rome.¹ The large number of Prakrits used by the author of the Mṛcchakaṭikam should not necessarily make him late, for no late drama exhibits so many Prakrits as this one, and Bharata's injunctions about the use of different Prakrits for different classes of people presuppose previous usage of this sort.² I do not believe now that the Trivandrum dramas hail from Bhāsa and I do not therefore feel disposed to accept the usual view³ that the Mṛcchakaṭika is based on the Cārudatta.⁴ So I make Aśvaghōṣa indebted to Śūdraka

¹ Strabo's Geography XV. 73 (MacCrindle, India as described by Classical Writers, p. 78). An earlier incident of a similar character is on record about Kalanos, contemporary of Alexander.

² The inscriptions of Aśoka show the formation of different Prakrits in different localities as early as the third century before Christ. And the author of the Ṛk-prātiśākhya (II. 16) indicates by the names Prācya-padaṅṭi and Pāñcāla-padaṅṭi for the hiatus of *a* after *c* and *o* respectively the presence even in that early age of one characteristic difference between Śaurasenī and Māgadhī.

³ E.g., Keith in Sanskrit Drama, pp. 128, 130.

⁴ This is not the place to discuss the vexed question of the authorship of Pandit Gaṇapati Śāstri's dramas but one thing may be mentioned. Bāṇabhaṭṭa says about Bhāsa "मूलधारकृतारम्भेनाटकेष्वहुभूतिकाः सप्ततैर्यशो लेभे भामो देवकुलीरिव," whereas the Trivandrum dramas have no *patākā* in them and hardly any *patākāsthānaka*. The Cārudatta is certainly an abridged version of the Mṛcchakaṭikam and not its original. Sajjalaka's humorous statement about the utility of his sacred thread, "नम्विदं दिवा ब्रह्मसूत्रं रात्री कर्मसूत्रं भविष्यति" in the Third Act of the Cārudatta (p. 56), must be containing an allusion to the contrast between the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Sūtra and the Vedānta Sūtra which can be understood only after Śaṅkara's refutation of the Jñānakarma-samuccaya theory. Vasantasenā's remonstrance "इदानीं नाहु वद्धावेहि" after

and not to an earlier Bhāsa. Āśvaghoṣa's preference of the Mṛcchakaṭikam over the dramas of Kālidāsa may be due to greater acquaintance, the reputed author being a king, or the work being nearer in point of time. A better reason may lie in the greater '*viṣaya-rati-para*' character of Sūdraka's drama :¹ Āśvaghoṣa's purpose was to rescue man from *viṣaya-rati* and he would best serve his purpose by making his characters begin with enjoyment and end with renunciation, as in the case of the Saundarananda. But the fragments are not sufficient to indicate the total absence of Kālidāsa's influence in the dramas of Āśvaghoṣa. "विदू०—भो धानञ्जय सिग्धं मिदमिदम्" soon after "अथ स्नानोदकम्" for example, in the hetaera drama of Āśvaghoṣa (fragments 13 and 109 of the Kuṣān M. S.)² might suggest the influence of Mālavikāgnimitra, Act II, "देवी—खिवृद्धेदु अज्जत्तो मज्जणविहिम् । विदूषकः—भेदि, विसेसेण पाणमोअणं तुवरावेहि ।" The characterisation of the hero (Somadatta) and his mistress (the hetaera Magadhavati) as *Cakravākamithuna* by Dhānañjaya, during their love quarrel, in Frag., 10a 3 and 11a 3) "न मे प्रियं यच्चक्रवाकमिथुनस्य [कलहः?]" etc.) may be due to Śakuntalā, Act III, "नेपथ्ये—चक्रवाकवद्दु आमन्ते हि सहश्ररं यं उअस्थिदा रअणी." It should be remembered that a pair of Cakravākas habitually separates everyday, whereas Somadatta and Magadhavati seem to have separated but once. "पारावतमिथुनस्य ब्रूहि कथं विग्रहो जातः ?" in 10b 3 is more appropriate and this makes me infer the influence of Kālidāsa in the

the Ceti's "एवं पुन अहिमात्रिआमहायभूदं दुहिणं उअनिदं," (Cārudatta, Act IV, end), certainly shows knowledge of the descriptions by Vasantasenā and the Viṭa, drawn out to an inartistic length in the Fifth Act of the Mṛcchakaṭikam. The Pishārodīs are not the only persons in India to challenge Gaṇapati Śāstrī's theory. See "Bhāsa; another side" in the Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik II, 247—264 by C. Kunhan Raja, another native of Malabar.

¹ No quotations from the Mṛcchakaṭika are needed to establish the point. But one from the Śāriputraprakaraṇa will prove of interest : "(ma)hato khu amodo gaviṇakule" (K., IV. r. s., l. 3, p. 394).

² Lüder's Bruchstücke, p. 70 and Sitzungsberichte, p. 410.

expression *Cakravākamithuna*. The meagre character of these tantalising fragments is much to be regretted.

Some people will here object that the dramas of Kālidāsa show a Prakrit much later than the Prakrit of Aśvaghoṣa. This I answer by a question—have we a single manuscript of any of Kālidāsa's works even half as old as the Palm-Leaf Manuscripts of these fragments discovered in Turfan? Thanks to the efforts of the grammarians and the uniform usage throughout India, the Sanskrit language has remained unchanged for centuries and the scribe or the Pandit never requires to alter the Sanskrit text he is copying or using *to his own contemporary or local type*. Not so has been the fate of Prakrit. The Prakrit language had more or less of the vernacular in it and it has changed so much as to make Prakrit of one period or locality almost unintelligible in another. Prakrit manuscripts or Prakrit portions in manuscripts of Sanskrit dramas have therefore suffered hard in the hands of these scribes or scholars, with the result that the same Prakrit text will be found in bewilderingly different forms in different manuscripts. Is not the difference between the Prakrit of the Bengali recension of the Śakuntalā and the Prakrit of its other recensions well known? A glance at the profuse *variae lectionis* at the bottom of any page of Professor Sten Konow's Karpūramañjarī will give an ocular demonstration of the great freedom that has been taken with Prakrit texts by transcribers. Mārkaṇḍeya in his Prākṛtasarvasva¹ has said that Rājasekhara has sometimes used in his Mahārāṣṭrī verses forms like पवडि or पवडे instead of the only correct पवडि or पवडे but in the Harvard text of the Karpūramañjarī, we find all words levelled down to the regular types recognised by grammarians. That an acute philologist like Professor Konow, fully acquainted with the best principles of western text scholarship, had occasionally to abandon the evidence of all his manuscripts for the sake of consistency or agreement with the grammarian's

¹ Granthapradarśani text, p. 54.

dicta¹ should make us ponder. I shall therefore hear of any argument about date based on the character of Prakrit only if contemporary manuscripts are compared. *Is it proper to compare the Prakrit of a manuscript written in Kuṣān script² with the Prakrit of our modern manuscripts and draw conclusions about the relative age of their authors?* We should remember that no Prakrit is illustrated by the fragments in the Central Asian script,³ and our information about Aśvaghōṣa's Prakrit is based on the manuscript in Kuṣān script. There can also be difference of opinion about the antiquity of Aśvaghōṣa's Prakrit; Professor R. L. Turner, for example, has not seen eye to eye with Professor Keith on the subject.⁴ Lastly I may draw attention to the archaic character of the Prakrit portions of Mahendra-vikrama-varman's Matta-vilāsa-prahasana, noticed by Professor Keith himself,⁵ resembling the Prakrit of the so-called Bhāsa whom the Professor would not assign the late date of the seventh century. All this proves that the antique character of the Prakrit of a drama depends more on the age of the manuscripts or the province of their circulation⁶ than on the age of the author.

I have shown above that some passages in Aśvaghōṣa's writings show certain influence of Kālidāsa, and the cumulative effect of the other agreements will certainly support my contention. Kālidāsa is therefore earlier than Aśvaghōṣa. His writings were also so very popular in the first or second century

¹ Karpūramañjarī, Preface, p. xxii.

² Lüder's, Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, pp. 3—11. The concluding sentence, "Auf jeden Fall aber bleiben sie die ältesten Handschriftenreste, die uns überhaupt aus Indien erhalten sind," should be particularly kept in mind.

³ Lüder's C. 1, 2 and 4, Sitzungsberichte, pp. 390—2.

⁴ See his review of Keith's Sanskrit Drama in J.R.A.S., 1925, pp. 174—6.

⁵ Sanskrit Drama, p. 185.

⁶ The manuscripts of the Trivandrum dramas hail from the extreme south, where Prakrit would be best preserved among non-Prakritic vernaculars.

A.D.¹ even in distant Sāketa, that the monk Aśvaghōṣa, wishing to convey lessons of religion, had to go out of his way and write in the form of Kāvya (and also of Nāṭakas).² This makes Kālidāsa earlier than Aśvaghōṣa by at least a century or two. Why should we then refuse to place Kālidāsa in the first century B.C., the traditional date for our greatest poet, when the presence of a Vikramāditya, King of Ujjayinī, is now seeming to be not impossible?³ I have no faith in tradition unsupported by other evidence, but I accept this particular tradition because there are some indications in favour of its correctness. That the Jain story makes the presence of a Śaka-extirpating Vikramāditya probable in the first century B.C. whose historical and geographical setting it conforms to, does not necessarily place Kālidāsa in that century. But the comparison between Aśvaghōṣa and Kālidāsa has indicated some such date for the latter and his works, particularly the Raghuvamśa, point in this direction, as I shall show below. I believe with most scholars that there is a background of contemporary history and geography in the Raghuvamśa and that

¹ i. e., the date of Aśvaghōṣa, which has to depend on that of Kaniṣka for Buddhist tradition is unanimous in making him Kaniṣka's contemporary. Some scholars make Kaniṣka begin his reign in 78 A.D., and others would have him reign from 120 A.D. I shall not enter into any discussion of this vexed question here nor shall I mention my own preference. It is sufficient for my purposes to suppose that Aśvaghōṣa must have lived about 100 A.D. in either case. His contemporary, Kuṣāṇ king would be Kaniṣka II according to Mr. R. Kimura (I.H.Q., Sept. 25, pp. 415-422).

² Students of Vedānta Literature will recollect the necessity Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the author of the Advaitasiddhi, felt for writing in the terminology and form of Navya Nyāya, without which he would not have been heard in Bengal in that age.

³ Rapson in Ancient India, p. 143 and later, in Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, pp. 532-3. I have given below (pp. 146-8n.) two extracts from the C.H.I. on the subject. The legend of Kālakācārya, Gardabhilla and Vikramāditya is contained, besides the Prakrit text published by Professor Jacobi in Z.D.M.G., vol. 34, pp. 258-278 (Vikramāditya mentioned on p. 267), in the Sanskrit Prabhāvakacarita of Candraprabhasūri (N.S.P., Bombay, 1909), pp. 36-46, and in the Kālakācārya Kathā published by the Āgamodaya Samiti as appendix to the Kalpa Sūtra (Bombay, 1920).

conclusions about the author's age can be drawn from the work. But others have read this background differently. Though few scientific scholars have placed the *Raghuvamśa* in the first century before Christ, I do not lose heart for the 4th or 5th century theory is not universal. Though some scholars would place *Kālidāsa* in the reign of *Samudra-Gupta* and *Candra-Gupta II*, others would make him contemporaries of *Kumāra-Gupta* or *Skanda-Gupta*, and some will have him in the time of *Yaśo-dharman*. But all these gentlemen follow the same principles and have worked on much the same lines. I therefore venture to attempt below a comparison between the political and geographical settings of the *Raghuvamśa* and the conditions of the first century B.C., following the self-same method.

The fact that *Kālidāsa* omits in the sixth canto of the *Raghuvamśa* some kings described as conquered by *Raghu* in the fourth and mentions some omitted there shows a purpose and certainly indicates that the two cantos were considerably influenced by contemporary history. In the fourth canto the following countries or peoples are described as conquered by *Raghu* :—"The eastern provinces" (v. 34), *Suhma* (35), *Vaṅga* (36-37), *Kaliṅga* (38-43), *Pāṇḍya* (49-50), possibly *Kerala* (54), *Aparānta* (58), *Pārasīkas* (60-64), *Hūṇas* (68), *Kāmbojas* (69-70), Mountaineers of *Utsavasāniketa* (77-78), and *Prāgjyotiṣa* (81-84).¹ In the sixth canto the following provinces are represented as sending suitors for *Indumatī's* hand :—*Magadha* (21—25), *Aṅga* (27—30), *Avanti* (31—36), *Anūpa* (37—44), *Śūrasena* (45—52), *Kaliṅga* (53—58), *Pāṇḍya* (59—66) and *Uttara Kośala* (68—79); of course, "अर्ये व्रजामोऽन्यतः" of v. 82 lets us know that there were other princes besides, but as they have not been named, *Kālidāsa* must have had a reason² for their omission. *Kālidāsa* does not describe in detail *Raghu's* conquest of *Magadha* or *Aṅga* but

¹ Not *Prāgjyotiṣa* (81-82) and *Kāmarūpa* (83-84).

² Their want of importance ?

he slurs over it in only half a verse; his actual words are “*पौर-
स्त्यानेवमाक्रामन् तांस्तान् जनपदान् जयी । प्राप तालीवनश्याममुपकण्ठं महोदधेः ॥*” The vagueness of expression should be particularly noted. Kālidāsa, therefore, did not want to offend the reigning princes of Magadha and Aṅga. For both he seems to have had great regard, as I shall show below. The only kings who appear on both the lists are those of Kalinga and Pāṇḍya. I shall show that Kālidāsa had some pique against them or at least no love for them.

Let us study the two lists a little carefully and let us proceed canto-wise. The kings of Magadha and Aṅga are mentioned explicitly only in the sixth canto and I may omit them for the present. Suhma and Vaṅga are separately mentioned. They were therefore distinct principalities and were not included in the home province of Magadha which was certainly the case in the Gupta period.¹ In IV. 38, we are told that Raghu marched towards Kalinga, being shown the way by the Utkalas. There was therefore no fight with the Orissans who may have had no separate kingdom in Kālidāsa's time or have been too insignificant for conquest. But Samudra-Gupta “subdued all the chiefs of the forest countries, which still retain their ancient wildness, and constitute the tributary states of Orissa.”² The Red-Arm (foreign ?) dynasty reigned in Orissa from 323 A.D. to 474 A.D., after which came the Keśaris who reigned in glory till 1132 A.D.³ But there is a blank before 323 A.D. and Kālidāsa seems to have lived before this date. Kalinga comes next and in discussing its historical bearing I may include the corresponding portion of the sixth canto.

¹ See R. D. Banerji's History of Bengal (in Bengali), Vol. I, Ch. 4 (also ch. 3 for the condition of Bengal during the centuries intervening between the decline of Maurya power and the rise of the Guptas).

² Smith, E.H.I.⁴, p. 300.

³ Hunter's Orissa, Vol. I, pp. 206, 232, and Vaidya's History of Mediæval India, Vol. I, pp. 319, 326.

That the Kalinga chief is mentioned in the sixth canto indicates that Kalinga was a principality of some note in Kālidāsa's time. But his defeat at the hands of Raghu indicates Kālidāsa's lack of sympathy for the Kalingans: Kālidāsa did not scruple to wound the family pride of the reigning king. Why, he must have had some grudge against him or his family as Ra., VI. 58, “प्रलोभिताप्याकृतिलोभनीया विदर्भराजावरजा तयैनम् । तस्माद-
पावर्तत दूरकृष्टा नीत्येव लक्ष्मीः प्रतिकूलदैवात् ॥,” indicates. Not only is the appearance of the king suggested to be non-attractive, he is himself likened to adverse fortune, a punishment that our poet has not inflicted on any other unsuccessful suitor. Kālidāsa's attitude may be due to personal reasons—he may have experienced ill-treatment at the hands of the king of Kalinga; or to political reasons—there may have been some long-standing quarrel between the Kalingans and Kālidāsa's own province.¹ Which explanation is more correct is certainly impossible to decide. But if we are permitted to consider the political explanation, some indication of date may be obtained. No political quarrel between Malwa and Kalinga is known in the Gupta period. But such a quarrel is intelligible in the first century B.C. Ujjayinī was at that time included within the empire of the Andhras or was closely

¹ I follow MM. H. P. Shastri (J.B.O.R.S., 1915, pp. 197 ff.) and others in believing Malwa to have been our poet's home. I do not believe in Pandit Mammathanāth's theory of Bengal as the home of Kālidāsa. A Bengali, to use an expression of my late colleague at Rangpur, Professor Suresh Chandra Datta Gupta, M.A., would not say “वङ्गान् वत्साय तरण,” etc. (Ra., IV. 36). The Pandit's arguments do not stand criticism, and non-refutation by serious scholars do not make them plausible. “वक्रः पक्ष्या यदपि भवतः प्रस्थितस्थानरागां सीधोत्सङ्ग-
प्रणयविमुखो साधन भूषणयिन्याः,” etc. (Me., I. 28), too, to quote another friend, Mr. Sudhāṃśu Kumār Sen-Gupta, M.A., of the same College, shows the province of Kālidāsa's love and habitual residence. Lastly, even Bengali tradition, as my grandfather Dr. Sir P. C. Banerji was emphasising the other day, is uniform in associating the name of Kālidāsa with Ujjayinī. The statement that the solar calendar has been peculiar to Bengal, and that throughout her history, shows a lamentable ignorance of facts or wilful neglect thereof. The puerile argument that the name of Kālidāsa is characteristic of Bengal does not even deserve refutation.

connected with them¹ and the Andhras and the Kalingans were neighbouring peoples and rivalry and frequent mutual aggressions would be natural in such cases. One Kalinga king of the preceding century, Khāravēla, made much mischief in neighbouring territories and Puṣyamitra² of Magadha (with whom Kālidāsa was certainly in sympathy) and the Andhras and their feudatories, the Rāṣṭrikas of the Marāṭhā country and the *Bhojakas of Berār* (the kinsmen of *Indumatī*, Kālidāsa's heroine) felt the steel of his arms.³ Kālidāsa may have had Khāravēla in mind when he likened a remote ancestor of the reigning king of Kalinga to “प्रतिकूलदैव” for the *Vidarbha* princess *Indumatī*. There was hardly any Kalinga kingdom of note in the fourth or fifth century A.D. Samudra-Gupta seems to have marched through the same province but he had to encounter several chieftains and the province was divided into petty principalities.⁴ I would therefore consider Kālidāsa's description truer to the conditions of the first or second century B.C. Ra., VI. 54, “असौ महेन्द्राद्रिसमानसारः पतिर्महेन्द्रस्य महोदधेश्च । यस्य वरत्सैन्य-गजशृङ्गेन यात्रासु यातीव पुरो महेन्द्रः ॥” with its repetition of *Mahendra*, might suggest to the Gupta period theorists that Kālidāsa was thinking of Mahendra of Kośala or Mahendra (Mahendragiri?)⁵ of Piṣṭapura of Samudra-Gupta's Allahabad Inscription. But such a conclusion is barred by the fact that Harīṣeṇa mentions

¹ C.I.I., I, pp. 531—4.

² If Bahasatimitra of the Hāthigumphā Inscription is identified with Bahasatimitra of the Pabhosā Inscription, the king of Magadha cannot be Puṣyamitra, but must be some successor of his. In any case, he was a Śuṅga and Kālidāsa seems to have been in sympathy with the whole house.

³ Hāthigumphā Inscription of Khāravēla, ll. 4, 6, 12 (J.B.O.R.S., 1917, pp. 454—7); Rapson, C.H.I., I, pp. 535—7, and Smith, E.H.I., pp. 209, 219.

⁴ Allahabad Inscription, ll. 19-20 (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, p. 7).

⁵ Mahendra according to Jouveau-Dubreuil (A.H.D., p. 59), and Fleet (C.I.I., III., p. 7, n. 2, ll. 34—6). But Professor Dr. Bhandarkar (I.H.Q., I, p. 252) prefers to connect *giri* with *Mahendra* and not with *Kautilya*. [But differently G. Ramdas in *ibid.*, 679ff.]

two Mahendras between whom we cannot possibly choose the man Kālidāsa could have referred to and they are both too far removed from the Mahendra hill to be rightly called “पतिर्महेन्द्रस्य”; and the former could not be also called “(पतिः) महोदधेश्च.” Besides, a poet of Kālidāsa’s type would hardly be so prosaic as to mention Samudra-Gupta’s adversary by his real name and not by a synonym. The verse rather suggests to my mind an indirect allusion to the Mahā-Megha-vāhana (=Mahendra) dynasty to which Khāravela belonged.¹ If Mr. Jayaswal is justified in identifying these Mahā-Megha-vāhanas with the Purāṇic Meghas of Kośala (whence Khāravela’s family certainly came), the dynasty must have passed away in the first century A.D.; for the Purāṇas mention only nine kings in the line² and they could hardly reign for more than a little over two centuries.

The next king mentioned as conquered is that of the Pāṇdyas. Some people, believing in the first century B.C. theory, want to make capital of the non-mention of the Pallavas, who reigned in the province between Kaliṅga and the territories of the Pāṇdyas from the end of the second century A.D. till the ninth century, or, as an insignificant power, much later. In Samudra-Gupta’s time the Pallavas were an important people and *Kāñcika-Viṣṇugopa*, whom Samudra-Gupta is represented as having defeated, was certainly a Pallava. In Yuan Chwang’s time too the Pallavas were an important power. But I do not feel disposed to draw any conclusion from the non-mention of the Pallavas by Kālidāsa for he also

¹ Hāthigumphā Inscription, l. 1 (J.B.O.R.S., III, pp. 435, 453, 461). The fact that an inscription at Khandagiri (Lüder’s 1347 ?) mentions another, king of Kaliṅga, Kudēpa-siri (Lüder’s Vakadēpa-siri = Vakradeva-Sri) with the title Mahā-Megha-vāhana shows that it was a family epithet; see R.D. Banerji’s note in *ibid.*, p. 505.

² “कोशजायां तु राजानो भविष्यन्ति महाबलाः । नेषा इति समाख्याता बुद्धिमन्तो न वैव तु ॥” (Pargiter, D.K.A., p. 51). That Mr. Pargiter puts this (and some other dynasties) in the third century A.D. does not go against us for Mr. Jayaswal (J.B.O.R.S., III, p. 484 n.) has shown that some of these dynasties were contemporaneous with the Andhras and that Mr. Pargiter has not here understood the Purāṇas correctly.

omits the Colas who were certainly an important power as early as Aśoka's time and as late as the twelfth century A.D. Kālidāsa may have omitted to mention other South Indian states because they were unimportant or because he himself wanted to avoid prolixity. अनाशास्यजयः in Ra., IV. 44, as interpreted by Mallinātha and others, may indicate that the southern powers were too insignificant for Raghu's steel. In any case, our poet had not set out to write history and what allusions he makes are only incidental. Kālidāsa has, however, suggested Pāṇḍya to be the most important king of the South in his day: “दिशि मन्दायते तेजो दक्षिणस्यां रवेरपि । तस्यामेव रघोः पाण्ड्याः प्रतापं न विपेहिरे ॥” (Ra., IV. 49), “अनेन पाणौ विधिवद्गृहीते महाकुलीनेन महीव गुर्वी । रत्नानुविद्धार्णवमेखलाया दिशः सपत्नी भव दक्षिणस्याः ॥” (VI. 63). Whether this was deliberate or not is uncertain. If it was deliberate, we have an interesting bit of historical information. South Indian history is still wrapped in great obscurity and full informations about the mutual relations of the three Southern Powers during the few centuries before and after the Christian era are not available. *The historians of South India will kindly investigate the bearing of this fact on the date of Kālidāsa.* I have no choice but to leave the question undecided. But one thing may be mentioned here. We know from Strabo (Bk. XV. 4, 73) that a Pāṇḍya king sent an embassy to Augustus Cæsar in the last quarter of the first century B.C.¹ Similar information is not on record about the two other powers, particularly about Kerala which had a western foreign trade. This may indicate the pre-eminence of the Pāṇḍyas in the first century B.C. That king is represented by Strabo (XV. 73) as laying claim to a suzerainty over 600 princes ; they might mean the numerous Tamil chieftaincies of the three states. It is true that Strabo says the king was Poros and not Pandion according to some writers but the latter should be preferred on *a-priori* grounds,

¹ MacCrindle, *Ancient India*, as described by Classical Writers, pp. 9, 77, and C.H. I., Vol. I. p. 597.

for since Alexander's famous fight with a king Poros, 'Poros' would become the usual type for an Indian prince's name to an uninformed westerner. A Pandion may be mistakenly called a Poros but not the other way. Mr. Rawlinson's preference for 'Poros'¹ does not therefore commend itself to me. Could not a Pāṇḍyan sending an embassy to Rome get a letter written in Greek when trade with the west had been established long? Mr. Rawlinson's suggestion that the king was a Kuṣāṇ monarch, cannot be accepted for no such reigned in India as early as 23 B.C.² The Periplus of the first century A.D. mentions (§54) the *Kingdoms* of Cerobothra (Kerala-putra) and Pandian but we find no mention of the Colas or their kingdom, though two Cola ports (Poduca and Sopatma) are named (§60). Is this not suggestive? One may also recollect here the special mention of the Pāṇḍyas in the extant fragments of Megasthenes.³ To this may be added the fact that the inscription at Hāthigumphā mentions (l. 13) Khāravela attacking the Pāṇḍya king in the twelfth year of his reign; and the kings of Cola and Cera countries are not mentioned. Immediately after the reference to the despoiling of Aṅga and Magadha (l. 12) we have this reference to the Pāṇḍya-rāja and there seems to be a summing up of the conquests and the mention of its effect in the following line. We may therefore believe that no portion of the inscription has been lost that made any reference to conquest of, or diplomatic relations with, the Colas or the Ceras. This may justify the conclusion that the Pāṇḍya was the chief power in South India in the second century B.C. Karikāla Cola in the first or second century A.D. may have turned the balance against the Pāṇḍyas for the first time.

I cannot draw any conclusion from the mention of the king of Pāṇḍya as “उरगाख्यस्य पुरस्य नाथम्” (Ra., VI. 59). That

¹ India and the Western World, p. 108.

² Smith, E.H.I., pp. 265 ff.; C.H.I., I., pp. 580 ff., 702-3.

³ MacCrindle, Ancient India, as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, pp. 201, etc.

Uragākhyā pura means Nāgapura, as explained by Hemādri or Mallinātha, or Nāgapattan in the Rājamahendry district, as suggested by Nandargikar,¹ is impossible. C. V. Vaidya, in a paper on "The Pāṇdyas and the Date of Kālidāsa,"² identifies "उरगाख्य पुर" ("the city named *Uraga*") with Uraiṃyūr and infers that Uraiṃyūr was the Pāṇḍya capital before the Colas under Karikāla conquered the Pāṇḍyas and established their own seat there. But history or legend nowhere records that Uraiṃyūr ever was a Pāṇḍya capital; the indications are rather just the other way. Leaving out pre-historic times, when North Mañjalūr may have been the Cola capital,³ Uraiṃyūr was certainly the chief seat of Cola Government in the historical period. Karikāla Cola shifted the capital to Kāveripattinam⁴ but before that Uraiṃyūr must have been the Cola headquarters. But it is not, of course, impossible that a Pāṇḍya was reigning in the first century B.C. at a conquered capital, as Vaidya believes and K. G. Sankara doubts,⁵ but want of facts should deter us from making this assumption. The identification of *Uragākhyā pura* with Uraiṃyūr I therefore consider as unsuccessful.⁶ Madura, so far as is known, was the earliest Pāṇḍya capital. Mr. Sankara has laid North Indian students under great obligation by informing them⁷ that the Tamil name of Madurā is Alavāy = 'Snake'; *uragākhyā pura*

¹ Raghuvamśa, 3rd ed., Bombay, 1897, notes, p. 123.

² A.B.I., II, pp. 63—8.

³ See V. V. Iyer's interesting paper "The Adventures of the God of Madura" in Indian Antiquary, 1913, pp. 65—72. [Had the legend recorded there any genetic connexion with the story of the Kumārasambhava?]

⁴ S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, p. 93.

⁵ A.B.I., II, pp. 189—191.

⁶ But Mr. Sankara's objection that *-ākhyā* shows that *uraga* or *uraya* could not be the first part of the name—as *gajāsāhvaya* means Hastināpura and not Gajapura—is not convincing. We say *gajāsāhvaya pura* and not *gajāhvaya pura* in the case of Hastināpura, and we have on the other hand cases like कपिलाद्वयं पुरं for Kapilāvastu, e.g., in Buddhacarita (I. 94) and Lalitavistara (ed. Lefmann, Vol. I., pp. 101, 113).

⁷ In the paper in A.B.I., cited above.

can therefore be none other than this famous city. Kālidāsa shows himself in Ra., IV. 49—50 and VI. 60—65 as well acquainted with the Pāṇdyas and he must have travelled widely in that land; this bit of local touch may be due to the knowledge thus obtained. In spite of phonetic resemblance we should set aside Mr. Vaidya's equation and prefer Madurā as the Pāṇḍya capital meant by Kālidāsa, especially when Raghu enters the Pāṇḍya territory long after crossing the Kāveri (Ra., IV. 45) on whose bank Uraiyūr certainly was. Uraiyūr or Madurā, “उरगाढ्यपुर,” gives us no help for date. But does non-mention of Pāṇḍya patronage of letters in the sixth canto of the Raghuvamśa (as in the case of the king of Aṅga, Ra., VI. 29) indicate that Kālidāsa lived before the age of the famous Tamil Sangam?¹

After conquering the Pāṇdyas, Raghu proceeds towards the western coast. Whether Verse 54 (भयोत्सृष्टविभूषाणां तेन केरल्यो-
पिताम् । अलकेषु चमूरेणुश्चूर्णप्रतिनिधीकृतः ॥) indicates an actual fight with the Keralans or mere passage through their territory is not certain. Verse 58 tells us that the king of Aparānta yielded tribute to Raghu. We are familiar with this name in the inscriptions of Aśoka. Scholars who believe that Kālidāsa's description of Raghu's *dig-vijaya* is based on the conquests of the Gupta kings could seek for the parallel to this conquest of Aparānta in Samudra-Gupta's conquest of Devarāṣṭra = Mahārāṣṭra. But Jouveau-Dubreuil² calls into question the identification of Devarāṣṭra mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription with Mahārāṣṭra and himself places it in the Vizagapatam district.³ There is therefore no parallelism between Kālidāsa's description and the description in the Allahabad Inscription. One should note here that Kālidāsa makes Raghu

¹ Second and third centuries after Christ (S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, Ch. XIV, Beginnings of South Indian History, Ch. IV). K. V. S. Iyer's theory of a much later date is not accepted by scholars. See K. G. Sessa Aiyar in I.H.Q., I., 473-82, 643-52.

² A.H.D., p. 60.

³ Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar accepts this identification (I.H.Q., I., p. 254). [But G. Ramdas (*ibid.*, p. 687) pleads for Mahārāṣṭra.]

keep to the extreme west and avoid Central Deccan. We have a poetical significance here : Raghu should not be represented as conquering the country of his future son's would-be father-in-law, the king of Vidarbha (or his overlord, the Andhra king, if he had any). There may be also an historical reason : Kālidāsa may have wanted to avoid the conquest of the Andhra territory, because Ujjayinī was politically connected with it in his time which was certainly the case in the first century B.C.¹ Vikramāditya who, according to Jaina tradition, came from Pratiṣṭhāna and drove out the Śakas from Ujjayinī about 57 B.C. may have been also related to the Andhras.² Non-conquest of Avanti follows as a matter of course, for Raghu has been already made to take a more westerly direction. I do not therefore deduce any conclusion about date from the avoidance of Avanti, as Mr. Dhanapati Banerji has, for example, done,³ particularly because this would be intelligible in any century—Kālidāsa would certainly avoid the indignity of his own province.

We have next the conquest of the Pārasikas. As the passage is important, I shall quote all the verses : पारसीकांस्ततो जेतुं प्रतस्थे स्थलवर्त्मना । इन्द्रियाग्यानिव रिपूंस्तत्त्वज्ञानेन संयमी ॥६०॥ यवनीमुखपद्मानां सेहे मधुमदं न सः । बालातपमित्राब्जानामकालजलदोदयः ॥६१॥ संग्रामस्तुमुलस्तस्य पाश्चात्त्यैरवसाधनेन । शार्ङ्गकूजितविज्ञेयप्रतियोधे रजस्यभूत् ॥६२॥ भल्लापवर्जितैस्तेषां शिरोभिः श्मश्रुलैर्महीम् । तस्तार सरघाव्यासैः स चौद्रपटलैरिव ॥६३॥ अपनीतशिरस्त्राणाः शेषास्तं शरणं ययुः । प्रणिपातप्रतीकारः संरम्भो हि महात्मनाम् ॥६४॥ विनयन्ते स्म तद्योधा मधुभिर्विजयश्रमम् । आस्तीर्णा-जिनरत्नासु द्राक्षावलयभूमिषु ॥६५॥ Verse 60 tells us that Raghu went *by a land route*, which shows that there was an alternative sea route. The Persians were therefore conquered in Persia and not in Gujerat or Sind, as is often

¹ C.H.I., I, pp. 531—3.

² Mr. Harit Krishna Deb in the Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, Vol. I, pp. 250—302, identifies him with Gautamīputra Śātakarṣi and places the latter in the middle of the first century B.C.

³ Q.J.M.S., Vol. X, pp. 79-80.

believed.¹ This verse rouses in our mind an *ākāṅkṣā* for learning the result of this expedition and the following verses therefore cannot tell us of a different conquest. Consequently यवनी in V. 61 means a Persian lady and Mr. Sankara is not justified in saying, "In the *Raghuvamśa* (IV. 61), Raghu is said to have defeated the Yavanas on his way from Trikūta to the land of the Pārasīkas, i.e., in the Indus delta,"² nor also any other scholar who believes that Raghu separately defeated the Yavanas and the Pārasīkas. What our text warrants us is that Kālidāsa has confused the Persians with the Yavanas. This is remarkable for our poet who is so very accurate in his observations and expressions. The fact has a very important bearing on the date of Kālidāsa. Since the middle of the third century before Christ the Parthians were reigning in Persia and their rule continued till 225 A.D. Prior to them the Greeks were ruling there. When the Arsacidians came to power, the Greek population was not driven out but remained in Iran. Eastern Iran which probably Kālidāsa means as the land of the Pārasīkas conquered by Raghu had in the first century B.C. a strong Greek element in its population, the residuum of the previous Bactrian Greek ascendancy; some petty Yavana chiefs were also reigning in this region about this time.³ To this should be added the fact that the Parthian kings called themselves *Philhellenes* and struck coins with Greek legends; they were more Hellenistic in culture than Persian. Under such circumstances Kālidāsa could well confuse between the Yavanas and the Pārasīkas in Persia (Eastern Persia?). Does not this place Kālidāsa in the Parthian period? Non-mention of the Yavanas in the Gupta inscriptions, particularly in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra-Gupta, distinctly

¹ I am very glad to find Mr. Dhanapati Banerji (*ibid.*, p. 94) emphasise this point. For maritime commerce between Barygaza (Broach) and Persia in that early period see the Periplus of the Erythraean sea.

² I.H.Q., I, p. 313.

³ C.H.I., Vol. I, Ch. XXIII.

shows, if any proof is necessary, that there was no Yavana power or population to the frontier of India in the Gupta period. Professor Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, with whom I was discussing the question in March 1924, told me that "Kālidāsa has confused between the Greeks and the Persians and that is all." He did not want me to go further than that. But I cannot help doing this as I am fully convinced of the habitual accuracy of Kālidāsa's expressions. Kālidāsa mentions the Yavanas and the Yavanas alone (and not the Pārasīkas) as encountering the Śuṅga army in his *Mālavikāgnimitra* and other evidences indicate that Puṣyamitra had actually a tussle with Yavanas (and not Pārasīkas). I therefore explain this single confusion of Kālidāsa¹ by the large Yavana element in the Persian (especially East-Iranian) population of the first century B.C. Verses 61 and 65 tell us of the plenty of vine in the country of the Pārasīkas and this is still true of certain parts of modern Persia and Afghanistan.² Verse 62 informs us that the Persians fought on horseback. We know from Herodotus (Bk. I. §136) of the Persian fondness for horsemanship and Bactria which may have been the place where Kālidāsa makes Raghu fight the Persians³ was noted both for horses and the vine.⁴ The mention of beards of the Persians has, strangely enough, caused some trouble to a scholar of great note, because 'the Parsees are clean-shaven and so must have been their ancestors.' But not all modern Parsees are clean-shaven⁵ and ancient Persians,

¹ My friend Professor Pramathanāth Sarkār, M.A., of the City College and the Calcutta University, a rare Kālidāsa scholar, says that Kālidāsa has not confused the two peoples at all but has simply referred to their admixture. If this interpretation is accepted, my argument about the poet's date applies with greater force.

² Keane's *Asia*, 1896, Vol. II, pp. 25, 486. I have used the term 'Persia' in a wide sense.

³ Cf. Kṣīrasvāmin in his commentary on the *Amarakośa* (ed. Oka, p. 110), बह्लीकदेशं वाह्लीकं यद्रघोरुत्तरविजये "दुधुर्गजिनः स्कन्धोन्नतकुङ्कुमकेरान्," which shows that ere this Raghu was not far off from Bactria.

⁴ Rawlinson, *Bactria*, pp. 2-3.

⁵ I have one Parsee friend in Calcutta who has a nice beard and it is well known that the Parsee Dasturs (who necessarily conform to old ways) do grow most venerable beards.

as we know from their sculptures, did have a luxuriant growth of beard.

The three following verses (66—68) are again important and they are : “ततः प्रतस्थे कौवेरीं भास्वानिव रघुर्दिशम् शरैरुग्रैः किलोदीच्यानुद्धरिष्यन् रसानिव ॥६६॥ विनीताध्वश्रमास्तस्य वंचू- (v. l. सिन्धु-)-तीरविचष्टनैः । दुधुवुर्वाजिनः स्कन्धान् लग्नकुङ्कुमकेसरान् ॥६७॥ तत्र हृणावरोधानां भर्तृषु व्यक्तविक्रमम् । कपोलपाटलादेशि बभूव रघुचेष्टितम् ॥६८॥.” From Persia Raghu turns northwards (V. 66) and the Oxus (वंचू) falls on his way along whose banks his horses wander long (V. 67). वंक्ष्ण is the reading, according to Nandargikar, of Vallabha, a commentator earlier than Hemādri, Cāritravardhana, Mallinātha and Sumativijaya, who all refer to him¹ and वंचू of Cāritravardhana and वंचू of Sumativijaya; the other readings are मंचू and सिन्धु.² From this we may safely infer that वंचू- was the original reading and understand the Oxus to have been meant by Kālidāsa. Mallinātha changed ‘वंचू-’ to ‘सिन्धु’ because the name was unknown for any Indian river—these commentators could not realize that Raghu was now outside India! Cāritravardhana throws out the wild guess that वंचू was a lake in Kashmir — “वङ्क् नाम काश्मीरो ह्रदः.” Why? Because saffron mentioned in the last line of the verse grows in Kashmir (“काश्मीरदेशे कुङ्कुमक्षेत्राद्बहुल्यात्तत्र विचष्टनेन लोडनेन लग्नकुङ्कुमकेसरत्वं युक्तम्” — Cāritravardhana³). And Mallinātha removes all difficulties by boldly reading ‘सिन्धु’ for ‘वंचू’-‘वंक्ष्ण’-‘वंचू’- or ‘मंचू’-; the Indus certainly flows through Kashmir. Apart from the extant readings of the earlier commentators, there is a very strong objection against the reading ‘सिन्धु’- (=the Indus)—‘स्थलवर्मना’ in Verse 60 has already indicated that Raghu is no more on Indian soil. As regards saffron, on which Raghu’s horses rolled, the flower does grow in Persia,⁴ though the fact is not generally known. Raghu was now in the north-eastern

¹ Nandargikar’s *Raghuvamśa*, 3rd. ed., Introduction, p. 11.

² *Ibid.*, Text, p. 115, critical notes on V. 67.

³ See selection from the commentaries in *ibid.*, Notes, pp. 81-2.

⁴ See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed., Vol. 23, p. 999.

frontier of Persia. Though Kālidāsa does not expressly tell us that Raghu crossed the Oxus, we may confidently believe that is what the poet meant. In Ra., V. 42, we are told that Aja reaches the banks of the Narmadā and its crossing is not anywhere referred to ; but the prince must have crossed the river before he could reach Vidarbha territory. Ra., IV. 68, describes in one short verse Raghu's conquest of the Hūnas. 'The mention of the Huns is commonly believed' to preclude the 'possibility of a date earlier than the fifth or sixth century A.D. But Indian knowledge of the Huns in the first century B.C. is not impossible. The Huns are mentioned as Hunus in the Yashts (V. 53, 57, X. 113, XIII. 100 and XIX. 86, also XIX. 41?) of the Avesta² which can hardly date from a post-Christian era. The erection of the great Chinese Wall led to certain important race migrations in the second century B.C. The Hiung-nu (=Huns), against whom the wall was intended, fell upon the Yuch-chi, a people belonging to the same stock, in 165 B.C. and displaced them from Kan-suh in North-Western China. The Yueh-chi, in their turn, routed the Wu-sun in the country of the Ili river and continued their journey westwards. One section of these people, the Great Yueh-chi, settled on the north of the Jaxartes after driving the Śakas from there. But they could not long remain in peace in this country. The infant son of the Wu-sun chief whom the Yueh-chi had killed had now grown up to manhood under the protection of the Hiung-nus, the old rivals of the Yueh-chi and he now (c. 140 B.C.) with their help attacked the Great Yueh-chi and drove them to the south of the Oxus.³ The Hiung-nus could have now lived (in

¹ Huth, *Die Zeit des Kālidāsa*, pp. 23-32 ; Hillebrandt, *Kālidāsa*, p. 13, and K. G. Sankara Iyer, summarising Indian and English opinions, in *Q.J.M.S.*, Vol. IX, pp. 46, 49—51.

² J. J. Modi, in *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, pp. 65—80.

³ See among other summaries, M. A. Stein, *I.A.*, Vol. 34, pp 75-6, C. H. I., Vol. I, pp. 565-6, and Smith, *E.H.I.*, pp. 263-5 ; also see Stein in the *Geographical Journal*, May 1925, pp. 397 ff., for fuller particulars on some points.

(small detachments?) to the north of the Oxus or may have frequently made incursions there. Since 115 B.C. the Kansu region had been freed of the Hiung-nus and they were now confined to the Tien-shan whence they could pounce on only the people to the south-west: the two Chinese walls made depredation on Chinese territory now impossible, and the Oxus region was in a direct line for the frequent attacks of those marauding horsemen. Tales of Hiung-nu depredations would be easily carried to Persia c. 100 B.C. or earlier and also to India about that time through traders.¹ Could not Kālidāsa know of the Hūṇas in the middle of the first century B.C. from the (Persian) Śakas of Ujjayinī or from traders? The poet does not precisely tell us if the Hūṇas lived to the immediate north of the Oxus or were some way off. We should also remember that the Yueh-chi who were living to the north of the Oxus about 140 B.C. seem to have been akin in race to the Hiung-nus.² It should be noted that Kālidāsa has left some interesting local touches for all the other principalities or peoples conquered by Raghu, but for the Hūṇas he could only say that Raghu caused their women to slap their own cheeks at the loss of their lords.³

¹ A brisk trade between China and western countries, including Persia and India, began in the reign of the great Han Emperor Wuti (140-87 B.C.) and silk was the chief thing exported from China. We find Kālidāsa refer to this new ware as *Cīnāmśuka* (Chinese cloth) in *Śakuntalā*, Act I, last verse and Ku., VII. 4. We have here a delightful bit of anachronism like the reference to the importation of spices in Ra., VI. 57. For Chinese trade with India about this time see "Periplus of the Erythraean Sea" (Schoff), §64: "After this region under the very north, the sea outside ending in a land called Thinæ, there is a very great inland city called Thinæ, from which raw silk and silk yarn and silk cloth are brought on foot through Bactria to Barygaza, and are also exported to Damirica by way of the river Ganges." Of course, silk had begun to be imported into India much earlier (Schoff, p. 264).

² See Smith, E.H.I., p. 262, and n. 1, and M. Aurel Stein's paper "White Huns and Kindred Tribes in the History of the Indian North-West Frontier," in I.A., Vol. 34, pp. 73-87, referred to above.

³ Professor Bhandarkar in the course of the conversation referred to above said there might be a local touch in the slapping of the cheeks; it is generally the head or the breast that an Indian

This shows conclusively that Kālidāsa knew not much of the Hūnas or their country and what little he knew was from mere hearsay. I cannot therefore believe that mention of the Hūnas in Ra., IV. 68, necessarily makes Kālidāsa live after 420 A.D. or later still and I am very glad to find Professor Keith remark, "The exact identity of the Hūnas of the epic is immaterial; as the name had penetrated to the western world by the second century A.D. if not earlier, there is no conceivable reason for assuming that it could not have reached India long before the fifth or sixth centuries A.D." ¹ That a well-travelled and well-informed man like Kālidāsa could not secure any precise information about the Hūnas certainly suggests that they were not living in the neighbourhood of India in his time. The discovery of the earlier reading 'वंक्षू' or 'वंक्ष' or 'वंक्षू' for Mallinātha's 'सिन्धु' has dispelled the old illusion that Kālidāsa places the Huns in Kashmir and the information about the growth of saffron in Persia supplied by the Encyclopædia Britannica removes all doubts.

The other peoples conquered by Raghu are unimportant for our purpose. But before taking leave of Canto IV, I must make some remarks about the alleged Gupta basis of Kālidāsa's *digvijaya* story. Mark Collins believes in this origin and he has drawn up a comparative table of the countries conquered by Raghu and those conquered by Samudra-Gupta (including some with which S. had but diplomatic relations).² But no great pains are required to

woman strikes in grief. My brother-in-law Mr. Santosh Kumar Banerji, a Persian scholar, tells me that slapping the cheek is a Persian custom, and my friend Mr. M. Naimur Rehman of our Persian and Arabic Department corroborates Mr. Banerji's statement from personal observation. The custom also seems to have been known in some part of Arabia. But no such information is available about the Huns. [Does K. ascribe to the Huns a Persian custom?]

¹ Sanskrit Drama, p. 145. I may here refer to the mention of Hūna-lipi in the Lalitavistara (ed. Lefmann, p. 126), which even in its present form can hardly be as late as the fifth century A.D.

² Geographical Data of the Raghuvamśa and Daśakumāracarita, Leipzig, 1907, pp. 57—9.

realise the want of real parallelism. Collins has noticed one difficulty, that the geographical terms used by Kālidāsa are different from and earlier than those used in the inscriptions of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. He has sought to explain this discrepancy by assuming that Kālidāsa used conventional geography! This is but natural because he started with the given premise that Kālidāsa lived sometime "between 400 and 600 A.D." We have now sufficient reason for placing our poet much anterior to 400 A.D., and we need not therefore brand his geographical terms as conventional. That he has been purposely¹ a little archaic here and there I do not want to deny, but he has been mostly true to the conditions of the first century B.C. Mr. Radhagovinda Basak attempted a more thorough parallelism between Raghu's *digvijaya* and Gupta conquests² and it seems at first sight that he has completely succeeded. But careful scrutiny will reveal that he has exaggerated the resemblances and has sometimes interpreted the inscriptional evidence in the light of Kālidāsa.³ It should be noted that there is nothing in the fourth canto of the *Raghuvamśa* corresponding to Samudra-Gupta's receipt of tribute from some Punjab tribes, or his violent uprooting of the neighbouring chiefs in Āryāvarta. A. Gawronski's explanation of the latter discrepancy⁴ must be considered a poor

¹ We should remember that the supposed date of his story is earlier than his times by at least several centuries.

² In a paper communicated to the Second Oriental Conference at Calcutta. See Proceedings, pp. 325—334.

³ Compare, for example, his supposition that Candragupta I re-established the family of the reigning princes of Bengal after having conquered them, because Kālidāsa makes Raghu re-establish the King of Vaṅga after defeating him, though the Meherauli Inscription tells no such tale. The inscription mentions only the defeating of the Vaṅgas by Candragupta and it is not certain that this Candragupta is Candragupta I. He was probably the same person as Candragupta-Varman of Puskaraṇa (in Rajputana) who was a contemporary of Candragupta I. See I.A., 1913, pp. 217—9, Smith, E.H.I., p. 307 n., and R. D. Banerji's *বঙ্গবাহিনীর ইতিহাস*, ১ম ভাগ, পৃ: ৪০, ৪১, ৪৪.

⁴ "The Digvijaya of Raghu and some connected Problems" in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, Vol. I, Krakow, 1914-5, p. 46.

attempt. Nor does Samudra-Gupta *march against* the king of Kāmarūpa as Raghu does. I cannot therefore help believing that Kālidāsa has followed no actual historical model but his own imagination, and such epic model as may have existed before his time in describing the conquests of Raghu.¹ I may even say that Hariṣeṇa, the chronicler of Samudra-Gupta's conquests, derived some hints from Kālidāsa's poem and made much of his patron's petty conquests and described his defeats or indecisive engagements as *grahaṇa-mokṣānugraha-janita-pratāponmiśra-mahābhāgya*.² What induced Kālidāsa to make Raghu release the kings of Vaṅga and Kalinga after conquering them was probably the presence of these kingdoms in his time. And there was the additional driving factor in our poet's *ahimsā* predilections;³ see Ku., III. 20, Ra., V. 50, Ra., V. 57 (with VII. 61-62) and VII. 47—also IX. 14, XVI. 2, XVII. 42, which speak of similar restitutions of territories. *Before we utilise a poem for historical purposes we should determine fully the poet's view of life.* It is usual to believe that Samudra-Gupta was a mighty

¹ Compare Keith in J.R.A.S., 1909, p. 437 : "But, in truth, as Bühler pointed out, the poem shows in every line that Raghu's march is a poetical one, not a real one. Just as Somadeva copies Kālidāsa in an account presumably meant to be at least as historical as that of Raghu's conquests, so Kālidāsa followed the Epics, the Purāṇas, and other Kāvya writers. He makes Raghu conquer Pārasīkas, Hūpas, Kāmbojas, Yavanas, *et hoc genus omne* ; he simply defeats for him all warlike nations,....." I am in complete agreement with Professor Keith, except in so far as the Pārasīkas are concerned, for which see below.

² We read at school a certain text-book on Indian History, describing the battle of Chillianwalla as a drawn engagement and another as a victory for British arms ! A. Gawronski has himself (*loc. cit.*, pp. 48—55) shown the influence of Kālidāsa on Somadeva (in his description of Udayana's conquests). Another possible influence of Kālidāsa may be traced in the Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra, ascribed to Nāgārjuna and translated into Chinese before 405 A.D., in which a Bodhisattva is described as having "proceeded for a short time to Northern India to the country of the Yuetche to subjugate the Dragon King Apalala, and finally" as having gone "to the west of the Yuetche to conquer the Rakshasi" ! (Nariman, Sanskrit Buddhism, 1st ed., p. 194).

³ Probably under Jaina influence.

conqueror. But M. Jouveau-Dubreuil has shown that the belief is a little exaggerated, at least so far as the South is concerned.¹ I have a lurking suspicion in my mind that Samudra-Gupta's imagination was fired by the poet Kālidāsa's description of Raghu's *digvijaya* and he may have tried to imitate it, as far as it was then possible.² Raghu conquered the eastern and south-eastern powers and then turned southwards. Samudra-Gupta himself belonged to the eastern province of Magadha and he therefore first³ turned southwards. But meeting with a repulse there, after some success, he could not complete the circuit of South India,⁴ but retraced his steps conquering some more petty principalities. The easier conquests in North India have been made much of by his panegyrist and the diplomatic relations with some foreign powers, though true, may have been entered into by Samudra-Gupta or described by Hariṣeṇa in imitation of Raghu's conquest of the Persians, the Huns and the Kambojas. Kālidāsa could not flatter the Gupta

¹ A.H.D., pp. 58—61.

² Samudra-Gupta seems to have had a predecessor in Candrarman of Puṣkaraṇa, who claims to have conquered even Vāhlikā (Bahlik) where Kālidāsa made Raghu go.

³ The Allahabad Pillar Inscription describes the southern conquests first and M. Jouveau-Dubreuil seems justified (A.H.D., p. 59) in rejecting Vincent A. Smith's theory (E.H.I., p. 299) that Samudra-Gupta first "subjugated the Rājās of the Gangetic plain."

⁴ G. Jouveau-Dubreuil (A.H.D., pp. 59, 60) shows that Devārāṣṭra is not Mahārāṣṭra, nor is Eraṇḍapalla in Khandesh. Professor Bhandarkar (I.H.Q. I, p. 253, 254) seems to accept Monsieur Jouveau-Dubreuil's identifications. It would be proper for me to mention here Professor Dr. Radhakumud Mukherji's objection against the French scholar's rejection of Mahārāṣṭra and Eraṇḍol. He told me that it would be difficult for Samudra-Gupta to return by the way he had first marched for his conquered enemies would try to harm him and he would therefore take a more westerly direction. But the argument does not convince me and it is possible to infer from the text of the inscription that Samudra-Gupta did slightly alter his path, but still confining himself to the east coast. In support of an eastern locality for Devārāṣṭra, I may quote a verse occurring in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas, giving the territorial limits of the Devarakṣitas (of the fourth century A.D. ?): कोशलं विशालं चैव पुरी रम्यां भोदयन्ते देवरक्षिताः ॥ (Pargiter, D.K.A., p. 54.)

monarchs by making Raghu conquer lands which even Samudra-Gupta could not reach. Why do Gupta period theorists forget this? The first portion of the Allahabad Inscription of Samudra-Gupta, describing Candragupta's acceptance of this prince as heir-apparent and ensuing events, has a strong resemblance with the concluding portion of Raghuvaṃśa, Canto III, and the first few verses of Canto IV, where we have a similar description of Dilīpa's passing on of the crown to Raghu and the immediate effect of Raghu's accession. One would naturally think that Kālidāsa was influenced by the actual facts of Samudra-Gupta's accession, but is it certain that Hariṣeṇa did not use the court poet's usual hyperbole? I shall show the resemblances elsewhere but I may mention one parallel here: "दिलीपानन्तरं राज्ये तं निशम्य प्रतिष्ठितम् । पूर्वं प्रभूमितो राज्ञां हृदयेऽग्निरिवोद्गताः ॥" (Ra., IV. 2) possibly suggested "वीर्योत्तसाश्च केचिच्छरणमुपगता यस्य वृत्ते प्रणामे ॥"¹ of the inscription (l. 10.) ; compare also v. 4 (ll. 7-8) of the inscription with Ra., III. 68. And "साध्वसाधूदयप्रलयहेतुपुरुषस्याचिन्त्यस्य" of the inscription (l. 25.) may preserve a distant reminiscence of "अमुं युगान्तोचितयोगनिद्रः संहत्य लोकान् पुरुषोऽधिरोते" (Ra., XIII. 6) and of the verse preceding it ("तां तामवस्थां प्रतिपद्यमानं स्थितं दश व्याप्य दिशो महिम्ना । विष्णोरिवास्या-नवधारणीयमीदृक्तया रूपमियत्तया वा ॥").

But some historical facts may be after all behind Kālidāsa's story. I have already drawn attention to the fact that the king of Kāliṅga has been likened to adverse fortune in Ra., VI. 58, where Indumatī rejects him. This may have been due, as I have suggested, to the historical depredations of king Khāravela of Kāliṅga of the preceding century over the territory, among others, of the Bhojakas of Vidarbha. Kālidāsa has dilated over only three conquests, those of Kāliṅga, Persia and Kāmarūpa. The king of Kāmarūpa did not fight at all but the Kāliṅgans and the Persians did put up a tough fight. Kālidāsa has described these two fightings with some *animus*. The reason for his pique against the Kāliṅgans has been already

¹ Does 'यस्य वृत्ते प्रणामे' mean 'whose coronation salute being done'?

indicated and that for the Persians I shall suggest now. The Jaina legend in connexion with Kālakācārya's history represents him as going out of India and bringing the Śakas from the other side of the Indus to dethrone and kill Gardabhilla of Ujjayinī. The chiefs of these foreigners are termed Śāhis and their overlord Śāhānu Śāhi.¹ The titles are Persian and we know that the Śakas in and to the north-west of India in the first century B.C. were under the Parthians or were related to them.² Kālidāsa's fair Ujjayinī remained under foreign rule till (Gardabhilla's son) Vikramāditya, so the tradition continues, came from Pratiṣṭhāna (Paithān) and drove out these Śaka-Pārthava usurpers. Our poet could not therefore cherish kindly feelings towards these Śakas or their suzerains, the Pārthians, and he made Raghu beard the Persian lion in his den. The foreign conquerors of Ujjayinī were Śakas and not Persians proper but they were vassals of the Persians and bore Persian titles and certainly followed Persian ways. We may therefore believe that Kālidāsa made Raghu conquer the overlords of these Śakas, the Persians, in their own home to wipe off, if he could, this national disgrace. The Kumārasambhava may have been written when the "demoniacal" foreigners were reigning in the heart of the sacred land of Avanti³ and the prince Vikramāditya⁴ may have been living in the court

¹ See Z. D. M. G., Vol. 34. pp. 262-3. Professor Sten Konow makes out the Indo-Scythian conquerors of India to be Iranian in stock and speech. See Modern Review, April, 1921 pp. 463—470.

² See Smith, E.H.I⁴, pp. 242 ff., Rapson, C.H.I., I, Ch. 23.

³ Cf. "तस्मिन् विप्रकृताः काले तारकेण दिवौकसः । तुरानाहं पुरोधाय धाम स्वायंभुवं युयुः ॥" (II. I), etc., of the Kumārasambhava. Students of Bengali Literature will here recall the case of the वृत्रनाशर (Vṛtra-Samhāra) of Babu Hemchandra Bandyopadhyaya.

⁴ I am not certain whether विक्रमादित्य was the name of the individual or the title assumed on accession, but the latter assumption would probably be more natural. Candragupta II, who reconquered Malwa from the Śakas about the end of the fourth century A.D., was probably the second man to assume the title of Vikramāditya, in imitation, as it seems, of the avenger of Gardabhilla. Similar attempts at imitation by King Bhoja of Dhārā of early eleventh century are known to scholars. Modern traditions about Vikramāditya

of Pratiṣṭhāna, planning the rescue of his ancestral kingdom from the yoke of the foreigners.¹ The Raghuvamśa was certainly a later work, possibly the last of Kālidāsa's writings. There was peace and prosperity now, and the poet takes an imaginary vengeance on the late disturbers of the peace.² I shall show below that Kālidāsa makes a veiled reference to Vikramāditya, king of Ujjayinī in the Raghuvamśa.

We may now turn to the sixth canto of the Raghuvamśa, where the qualities of some of the important kings of India are recounted before Indumatī and our poet incidentally gives us some idea of the political condition of India in his time (or shortly before). We are justified in making some inferences about contemporary conditions by the fact that there is little correspondence between Kālidāsa's political divisions and those in the Rāmāyaṇa and the earlier Purāṇas; Kālidāsa was therefore influenced more by the actuals of his day than

seem to contain elements from incidents in the reigns of these three kings. The Vikramāditya referred to by Hāla (V. 64) must necessarily be Gardabhilla's son. The greater part of Kālidāsa's literary career probably belonged to a period prior to Vikramāditya's patronage.

¹ I have given one possible explanation for the non-completion of the work; another may be that fear of the reigning Śaka chief made Kālidāsa leave his poem unfinished. I must mention here a view long held by my friend Professor Pramathanath Sarkar that the Kumārasambhava is not an incomplete poem but that its story has a natural and artistic end with the eighth canto. But I do not accept my friend's view as the Kumāra is not even conceived at the end of that canto.

² The Śaka invaders may have been known, when they first came, as Persians, and their true nationality may have been realised only later. We have a somewhat similar case in the term 'फिरींगी' (Phiringī=Frank) used long in my province promiscuously for all Europeans. *The writer of the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea* (§38), knew the Śakas of Sind as Parthians. Kālidāsa's information about Persia may have been obtained not from travel in that land but only from the testimony of the Śaka intruders in Ujjayinī. *The information about the Hūnas may well have been received from this source,*

by the earlier writers. But it is possible that in some cases there is no correspondence between Sunandā's description and the real condition of the state in Kālidāsa's time.

The king of Magadha heads the list. He is described in Verses 21—24 and Verse 25 refers to his rejection by Indumatī. The verses may be quoted here:

“असौ शरयः शरणोन्मुखानामगाधसत्त्वो मगधप्रतिष्ठः ।
 राजा प्रजारजनलब्धवर्णः परन्तपो नाम यथार्थनामा ॥२१॥
 कामं नृपाः सन्तु सहस्रशोऽन्ये राजन्वतीमाहुरनेन भूमिम् ।
 नक्षत्रताराग्रहसकुलापि ज्योतिष्मती चन्द्रमसैव रात्रिः ॥२२॥
 क्रियाप्रबन्धादयमध्वराणामजस्रमाहूतसहस्रनेत्रः ।
 शच्याश्चिरं पाण्डुकपोललम्बान् मन्दारशून्यानलकांश्चकार ॥२३॥
 अनेन चेदिच्छसि गृह्यमाणं पाणिं वरेययेन कुरु प्रवेशे ।
 प्रासादवातायनसंश्रितानां नेत्रोत्सवं पुष्पपुराङ्गनानाम् ॥२४॥
 एवं तयोक्ते तमवेक्ष्य किञ्चिद्विस्त्रंसिदूर्वाङ्गमधूकमाला ।
 ऋजुप्रणामक्रिययैव तन्वी प्रत्यादिदेशैनमभाषमाणा ॥२५॥”.

Verse 22 distinctly shows that Magadha was the chief power in India in Kālidāsa's time. The Gupta period theorists read here a reference to the Imperial Guptas of Magadha. But, was an inglorious dynasty ruling in Magadha in the first century B. C.? The Mauryas were the paramount rulers of North India and though the Magadhan Empire had considerably diminished during the reign of the successors of Aśoka, Puṣyamitra, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty, did make some extension of territory; and though by the time of the Kāṇvas, who were reigning in the second and third quarters of the first century B.C., disintegration had again set in, the imperial glory had not altogether left the throne of Puṣpapura (Pāṭalīputra). The Kāṇvas may well be compared to the later Mughal Bādshāhs of India, who though Emperors in little more than name, did receive the honour of paramount rulers. The glory of the Magadhan throne extended in the past through the Śuṅgas, the Mauryas, the Nandas and the Śīśunāgas to the Purāṇic Bṛhadrathas. There is therefore nothing in verse 22 making for a late date.

The following verse refers to the performance of many sacrifices by the King of Magadha. Here too the Gupta period theorists see a reference to the performance of the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice by Samudra-Gupta after it was long in disuse (“चिरो-स्सन्नाश्वमेधाहृतुः”). But did not Puṣyamitra too revive the *Aśvamedha* ceremony of which we have an allusion in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, a circumstantial account in Kālidāsa's own *Mālavikāgnimitra* and a reference in the newly discovered Śuṅga Inscription?¹ That Kālidāsa had a great regard for the Śuṅgas is conclusively proved by his selecting the theme of his virgin drama from their history. And these Śuṅgas were not far removed in time from a writer writing in ± 50 B.C. Indumatī bows to the King of Magadha before she passes on to another king; no other king received the same treatment. This is, so says Mr. Bijay Chandra Majumdar, because the Guptas were the Emperors of North India in the fifth century A.D. But imperial title (with a nominal empire, if you like) is intelligible in the King of Magadha of pre-Christian centuries as well. The real reason for Indumatī's *pranāma*, however, seems to me to lie in the fact that a Brahmin dynasty was just then sitting on the throne of Magadha. The Kāṇvas (72 B.C.—28 B.C.) were certainly Brahmins and such may have been their predecessors, the Śuṅgas, too;² a Kṣatriya princess would naturally bow down before a Brahmin prince.³ This interpretation is probably supported by the

¹ Mr. K. P. Jayaswal in *Modern Review* for October, 1924 (pp. 430-2). The inscription (found in Ayodhya) gives the interesting information that Puṣyamitra performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice twice—“द्विरश्वमेधयाजिनः कृत्वापतेः पुष्यमित्रस्य” (*ibid.*, p. 431).

² See K. P. Jayaswal, *J.B.O.R.S.*, Vol. IV, pp. 257-260. MM. Pt. H. P. Shastri first offered this suggestion. The arguments of Pt. Shastri and Mr. Jayaswal convince me.

³ I do not blind myself to the artistic effect of making Indumatī pause a while before the first king she is introduced to and courteously bowing to him before rejection; she soon gets over her delicacy and rejects suitor after suitor till she comes to Aja. I do not want to forget that Kālidāsa was writing poetry and not history and I regret the lot of us twentieth century readers

expression—*labdhavarṇa* in v. 21, where a secondary meaning of “लब्धो वर्णः उत्तमवर्णः (a Brahmin's caste or, say, a twice-born's caste) येन” may have been also intended. The Kāṇvas were Brahmins and if the Śuṅgas too were not so, they were at least of a higher caste than the doubly fallen (casteless and heretical) Mauryas. Kālidāsa may have been thinking of Puṣyamitra when he wrote “प्रजारजनलब्धवर्णः” and “परन्तपो नाम यथार्थनामा” for the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty inaugurated a Brahmanical revival and gained popularity with the Hindu subjects who had so long been cast into the shade, and he certainly crossed swords with the Yavana invader Menander and defeated him.¹ It is also possible that our poet was thinking of Vāsudeva, the founder of the Kāṇva dynasty, who could well earn popularity with the subjects through the removal of the licentious Śuṅga king Devabhūti (—bhūmi.) No special significance can, however, be shown for *parantapaḥ* in this case.² Before taking leave of the king of Magadha, I must, in all honesty, mention one point which might go against my theory. Verse 21 makes this king “the refuge of persons seeking shelter” and we should probably read here an allusion to some well-known incident in the life of the contemporary king of Magadha or of any previous king

who have to read history in the finest poem. Still, an indirect hint at the caste of the contemporary king of Magadha does not seem to me incompatible with the artistic reason for this preferential treatment. [I may mention here a highly humorous explanation of this *praṇāma* proposed by Mr. Nriyālal Mookerji, late Principal of the Carmichael College, Rangpur. When I gave him one day my explanation of the obeisance, he said with a smile, “এটা বুঝতে পারলেন না? ইন্দুমতীর মনে হ'ল ‘ঠাকুরদা, তুমিও’?” (“Don't you understand the reason? Indumatī thought ‘Grandpa, thou too (art come)!’”)].

¹ Even if the whole fighting was done by his grandson, Prince Vasumitra, the credit goes to him.

² Vāsudeva = Kṛṣṇa was, however, famous as a killer of many foes, human and non-human.

(historical or Purāṇic).¹ From my present knowledge I cannot make out what incident in the first or any previous century before Christ our poet could have referred to. But there is a line in Hariṣeṇa's panegyric of Samudra-Gupta which does speak of that monarch's vouchsafing of help to other kings—"अनेकभ्रष्टराज्योत्सन्नराजवंशप्रतिष्ठापनोद्भूतनिखिलभुवनविचरणा-
शान्तयशसः (l. 23)."² This ought to make Kālidāsa posterior to Samudra-Gupta, but, as I have sufficient ground for believing that Aśvaghoṣa has borrowed from Kālidāsa and not Kālidāsa from him, I prefer to take Hariṣeṇa's statement as a hyperbole in the usual courtier's style and possibly under the influence of Kālidāsa. Later research may some day reveal to us some story of Puṣyamitra's helping of other (Brahmanical) states in throwing off foreign (or Buddhist) yoke.³ Can we read here any reference to Udayana's regaining of his ancestral land (encroached upon by the Kāśis)

¹ Possibly not Purāṇic, because 'वृषा इवोपप्लविनः परेभ्यो धर्मोत्तरं मध्यमनाश्रयन्ते' of Ra., XIII. 6, seems to indicate that such an incident was in the living memory of people. If Puṣyamitra is meant by Kālidāsa in Ra., VI, 21, he could certainly be described as 'धर्मोत्तरं मध्यमम्' in XIII. 6. [But was K. thinking of the refuge and help Vikramāditya received from the Andhra court? If performance of sacrifices could entitle Puṣyamitra to the epithet *dharmottara*, some Andhra chiefs (notably, the third, Śrī-Śātakarṣi) could lay claim to it (see Rapson, C. H. I., I. pp. 530-1). The son of Gardabhilla overthrown and killed by the foreign Śakas could certainly be alluded to as *upaplavin nṛpa*.]

² Cf. also "कृपणदीनानायातुरजनोद्धरणमन्त्रदीक्षादुपगतमनसः" in l. 26.

³ After I had written the above I referred the question to my friend Professor Pramathanath Sarkar. He said Kālidāsa was probably alluding to Puṣyamitra who must have helped many princes suffering from the attacks of Menander by defeating him or to Candragupta Maurya who certainly formed a league with many chiefs and helped them to throw off the Greek yoke. My friend was emphatic in his view that most of the kings thought of by Kālidāsa belonged to the immediate past and were not his contemporaries.

through the help of Darśaka, king of Magadha, with whose sister Padmāvati he contracted a political marriage?¹

After the king of Magadha is courteously rejected by Indumatī, Sunandā carries her to the king of Aṅga. A king of Aṅga is certainly unintelligible as a power distinct from the Gupta king of Magadha in the fourth or fifth century A.D., and neither Aṅga nor Campā come in for mention in any of the Gupta Inscriptions. Aṅga must have been included within the home province of the Gupta emperor. We must therefore assume that Kālidāsa's Aṅga-nātha belongs to the realm of legends. But if there was no distinct state of Aṅga in Kālidāsa's time, why did he introduce a king of Aṅga in the sixth canto of the *Raghuvamśa*? I have already drawn attention to the purposive character of Kālidāsa's selection. There are some indications about the presence of a state of Aṅga, distinct from that of Magadha, in the second century B.C., and the same condition may be safely inferred for the following century. Khāravela lays claim to having carried away the wealth of Magadha and Aṅga;² *Magadha and Aṅga were therefore distinct kingdoms in his time.* The king of Rājagṛha (l. 8) also may have been distinguished from Bṛhaspatimitra (= Puṣyamitra, according to Mr. Jayaswal) of Magadha (l. 12), though Mr. Jayaswal has identified the two.³ The mention of

¹ The story is given in the *Svapnavāsavadatta* and in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (possibly on the basis of the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya for the brief *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha* of Buddhavaṃśin makes a reference to Padmāvati). See Harit Krishna Deb's paper "Udayana Vatsa-Rāja," Calcutta, 1919.

² "*Aṅga-Magadha-vasum ca neyāti*"—Hāthigumphā Inscription, l. 12, J.B.O.R.S., vol. IV, p. 384.

³ See C.H.I., I, pp. 527, 537. Mr. Jayaswal has certainly made out a strong case for the identity of the king of Rājagṛha with Bhasatimitra, the king of Magadha. Mathurā and the adjoining regions were certainly within the sphere of influence of the house of Vīdhi (the Śuṅgas) at this time as numismatic evidence seems to indicate (*Ibid.*, pp. 525-6). But the language of the Hāthigumphā Inscription

a distinct king of Aṅga in Raghu, Canto VI, should therefore place Kālidāsa close to Khāravela's time. One verse of the Aṅga group (v. 79) gives us an interesting bit of information :
 “निसर्गभिन्नास्पदमेकसंस्थमस्मिन् द्वयं श्रीश्च सरस्वती च । कान्त्या गिरा सूनृतया च
 योग्या त्वमेव कल्याणि तयोस्तृतीया ॥ ” We may infer from this that the king of Aṅga was a great patron of learning in Kālidāsa's day—the poet may, for all that we know, have himself received his patronage. Will scholars search for a king of Aṅga answering this description in the first or second century B.C., or in the legendary period—or say in the fifth or sixth century A.D.? Scholars who make Kālidāsa recipient of Gupta patronage should notice that *the poet has made the king of Aṅga a scholar and patron of learning and not the king of*

seems to cast some doubt over the point. Bahasatimitra's identification with Puṣyamitra is possible but not certain. But Bahasatimitra of the Pabhosā Inscription (Lüder's 904) and of coins cannot certainly be Puṣyamitra. For how could Āṣāḍhasena, maternal uncle of Bahasatimitra, have lived till the tenth year of the reign of Odraka, the fifth Śuṅga king, if Bahasatimitra were Puṣyamitra, the first Śuṅga monarch? However, as this Bahasatimitra had relations in Mathurā, he could be identified with Bahasatimitra=king of Magadha (and Rājagṛha) of the Hāthigumphā Inscription, if we could bring down Khāravela to the time of Odraka and give up all thoughts of his contemporaneity with Puṣyamitra. Mr. Jayaswal has himself recently spoken of the uncertainty of palæographic evidence (Modern Review, October, 1924, p. 432). The Śātakarṇi referred to by Khāravela (l. 4) may well be Śātakarṇi II, the sixth Andhra king, and not Śrī-Śātakarṇi, the third monarch (as Mr. Jayaswal supposes, J.B.O.R.S., III., pp. 441-2). This supposition will probably remove all difficulties. The king of Magadha and the king of Rājagṛha of the Hāthigumphā Inscription will then easily mean the same person. The inscription may really have been incised in the 165th year since Aśoka's accession; for Aśoka was the “Muriya King” who conquered Kaliṅga and Candragupta had nothing to do with it. Of course I do not get any support for my theory from the interpretation of the inscription I myself propose but separate mention of Aṅga and Magadha in l. 12 is sufficient for my purpose.

Magadha. Kālidāsa's partiality for the king of Aṅga is also borne out by the next verse, “अथाङ्गराजादवतार्यं चक्षुर्याहीति जन्यामवदत् कुमारी । नासौ न काम्यो न च वेद सभ्यग् द्रष्टुं न सा, भिन्नरुचिर्हि लोकः ॥”¹

Next comes the king of Avanti. The verses being very important from my point of view I quote them in full :—

“ततः परं दुःप्रसहं द्विषद्भिर् (v. l. परेषां) नृपं नियुक्ता प्रतिहारभूमौ ।
निदर्शयामास विशेषदृश्यम् (v. l. विशेषकान्तम्) इन्दुं नवोत्थानमिवेन्दुमस्यै ॥३१॥

अवन्तिनाथोऽयमुदग्रबाहुर्विशालवच्चास्तनुवृत्तमध्यः ।

आरोप्य चक्रभ्रममुष्णतेजास्त्वष्ट्रेव यत्नोल्लिखितो विभाति ॥३२॥

अस्य प्रयाणेषु समग्रशक्तेरग्रेसरैर्वाजिभिरुत्थितानि ।

कुर्वन्ति सामन्तशिखामणीनां प्रभाप्ररोहास्तमयं रजांसि ॥३३॥

असौ महाकालनिकेतनस्य वसन्नदूरे किल चन्द्रमौलेः ।

तमिस्त्रपच्चेऽपि सहप्रियाभिर्ज्योत्स्नावतो निर्विशति प्रदोषान् ॥३४॥

अनेन यूना सह पार्थिवेन रम्भोरु कञ्चिन्मनसो रुचिस्ते ।

सिप्रातरङ्गानिलकम्पितासु विहर्तुं मुद्यानपरम्परासु ॥३५॥

तस्मिन्नभिद्योतितबन्धुपद्मे प्रतापसंशोपितशत्रुपङ्के ।

बबन्ध सा नेतृमसौकुमार्या कुमुदती भानुमतीव भावम् ॥३६॥

These verses plainly show that there was then sitting on the throne of Avanti a king (and no provincial governor) independent of Magadhan or any other control. Prior to the conquest of Malwa by Candra-Gupta II this region was under the rule of the Śakas (Western Satraps)² and it is highly doubtful if the sympathy of Kālidāsa would go out for these foreign usurpers. And after the Gupta conquest, Malwa was

¹ Will a Pandit Manmathanath Bhattacharya appear in Bihar and claim that Kālidāsa was a native of Bhagalpur District? My late lamented teacher Pandit Sarat Chandra Sāstri used to say that “of all the provinces of India Bihar has the best claim to call itself the home of the immortal poet of India.” His view, so far as is known to me, was based only on the nature of the local tradition and not on Ra., VI. 29. Kālidāsa was in all probability both a native and a resident of Avanti. He may have received only some help from Aṅga and even that is by no means certain.

² Smith, F.H.I., p. 307.

included in the Gupta empire and a ruler meriting Kālidāsa's description could hardly be a provincial governor or even a *yuva-rāja* holding the province for the crown. Several scholars like to make Candra-Gupta II the Vikramāditya who patronised Kālidāsa. But Candra-Gupta II was a king of Magadha and not of Ujjayinī, whereas Kālidāsa's patron is traditionally ascribed to Ujjayinī. I have no quarrel with persons who reject traditions altogether but I cannot understand the *ardhajaratīya* attitude of those scholars who accept one part of a tradition and conveniently ignore the other. If Kālidāsa's patron was a king named or titled Vikramāditya, he was also king of Ujjayinī; such Candra-Gupta II was certainly not, nor so any other later Gupta king. The poet has likened the king of Avanti to the Moon, newly risen, in verse 31, but he immediately corrects himself by comparing him to the Sun in the following verse. This probably suggests that Kālidāsa was thinking of the name or title of his patron, Vikrama-āditya. But verse 36 gives us a clear allusion to this name: "As the water lily cannot love the *Sun*, so could not that exquisitely delicate princess place her heart on him who causes his friend-lotuses to bloom forth and his enemy-mud to dry up at his *valour*." We have here both a comparison with the Sun (*Āditya*) and a mention of the king's valour (*pratāpa*, a synonym for *vikrama*). I cannot therefore doubt that we have here an exquisitely fine allusion to the name or epithet (Vikramāditya) of the king of Ujjayinī. It should be noted that the simile "as the lily does not like the Sun" has not been used in the case of any other suitor, though the opposite one, "as the lotus does not like the Moon," has been used twice—*cf.* "तस्याः प्रकामं प्रियदर्शनाऽपि न स क्षितीशो रुचये बभूव । शरस्त्रमृष्टाम्बुधरोपरोधः शशीव पर्याप्तकलो नलिन्याः ॥४६॥" and "स्वसुविदर्भाधिपतेस्तदीयो लेभेऽन्तरं चेतसि नोपदेशः । दिवाकरादर्शनबद्धकोशे नक्षत्रनाथांशुरिवारविन्दे ॥६६॥" There was therefore something deliberate in this expression and I conclude that *Kālidāsa has referred to*

*Vikramāditya, king of Ujjayinī, in the Raghuvamśa.*¹ I would identify this Vikramāditya with the Vikramāditya of Jaina tradition, who in the first century B.C. drove out the Śakas from Ujjayinī and established himself on the throne of his (father) Gardabhilla. “इन्दुं नवोत्थानमिव” in v. 31 probably refers to the new accession of this monarch and reference to the youth of the king in v. 35 points that way. It should be noted that Kālidāsa has not invested this suitor of Indumatī with a Purāṇic pedigree, as he has, for example, done in the case of the next king. The dynasty to which Kālidāsa thus makes reference had probably on that account but newly come to power. If we are justified in identifying this dynasty with “the seven Gardabhillas” of the Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas (Pargiter, D.K.A., p. 46), just before the Śakas, the family was certainly a new one, provided Gardabhilla was the first king. Jaina tradition makes Gardabhilla reign for 13 years and places an interval of 135 years between his son Vikramāditya’s accession and the coming back of the Śakas to power, with a Śaka

¹ I told Professor Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar of my interpretation of Ra., VI. 36, and I was glad to find that I convinced him. Of course the Professor does not share my view about the date of Kālidāsa—he places him in the sixth century A.D. Professor Dr. Radhakumud Mukerji recently drew my attention to a somewhat similar interpretation by Mr. Dhanapati Banerji in Q.J.M.S., Vol. X., pp. 77-8. Mr. Banerji deduces reference to Vikramāditya from the Avanti-nātha’s being compared to the Sun (in v. 32 c, d, and v. 36 d), and from the mention of his fine physique (in v. 32 a, b). Mr. Sankara (*ibid.*, p. 188) rightly objects that *vikrama* (valour) is not synonymous with a manly form. Mr. Banerji’s reply (p. 364) is ineffective for “अतिशक्तिता” (the synonym for “विक्रम” given by the Śabdakalpadrūma on the authority of Amara and Bharata and quoted with approval by Mr. Banerji) is not an exact equivalent for *vikrama* and is not even itself synonymous with a fine physique—a tall and largely built man is not necessarily “विक्रमी” and we should remember that among the Pāṇḍavas “विक्रम” has been ascribed to Arjuna and not to the giant Bhīma. I pin my faith on *pratāpa* in v. 36 c, which is certainly an exact equivalent for *vikrama* and the *āditya* I search for in the same verse. I have therefore not been wholly anticipated but am in any case glad to find another worker read a reference to Vikramāditya, king of Ujjayinī, in Ra., VI.

interregnum of 4 years between Gardabhilla and Vikramāditya.¹ A period of 148 years is not much too long for 7 reigns. But the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas make the Gardabhilla dynasty reign for only 72 years (“द्विसप्ततिः” or = 140?). We may therefore assume that the Gardabhilla dynasty ended with Sarasvatī’s transgressor and not begun with him. Vikramāditya, coming after the Śaka usurpation, will in any case have founded a fresh line; “इन्दुं नवोत्थानमिव” will apply in either case with the same force. “द्विषद्भिः दुःप्रसहम्” in VI. 31, may refer to the conquest of the Śakas by Vikramāditya. A similar allusion may also be contained in Ra., XI, 26-27. “स हत्वा लवणं वीरस्तदा मेने महौजसः । भ्रातुः सोदर्यमात्मानमिन्द्रजिद्वधशोभिः ॥ तस्य संस्तूयमानस्य चरितार्थैस्तपस्विभिः । शुशुभे विक्रमोदग्रं व्रीडयावनतं शिरः ॥” Compare also the title of the Vikramorvaṣīya and “दिग्ग्या महेन्द्रोपकारपर्याप्तैर्न विक्रममहिम्ना वर्धते भवान्” (B.S.S., 3rd ed., p. 16), “अनुत्सेकः खलु विक्रमालङ्कारः” (p. 18), etc., of its text.²

¹ Z.D.M.G., Vol. XXXIV, pp. 251, 267. The *Periplus* seems to supply an interesting confirmation of one of these particulars by calling the city of Ujjayini “formerly a royal capital.” Ujjayini probably passed about 78 A.D. into the hands of the Śaka prince Caṣṭana who may not have removed his capital there. Prior to this event the city must have formed for a long time the capital of a Hindu principality (connected, as numismatic evidence indicates, with the Andhra Empire). The *Periplus* does not record its date and there is great diversity of opinion on the point. Mr. Schoff in the Introduction to his translation (pp. 7-15) declared in favour of 60 A. D. but the view of the scholars of his ‘Second Group’ (80-89 A. D.—p. 292) commend itself to me. Mr. Schoff has, however, subsequently accepted 80 A.D. (See Smith, E.H.L.,¹ p. 245. n. 2); Ujjayini must have then recently lost its independence. Caṣṭana’s successors seem, however, to have shifted their capital to that holy city.

² I have given above complete reference to the sources of the legend of Kālakācārya, Gardabhilla and the Śakas. But as the texts are not well-known and as the Cambridge History of India, which has published a summary, has not yet attained the popularity it fully deserves, I give below two extracts from it, at the suggestion of my friend Mr. Nirendranath Ray Chaudhuri of the Bangabasi College, Calcutta:—

The next king is Pratīpa of Anūpadeśa. The fact that the description opens with an account (vv., 38—40) of his legendary ancestor Kārtavīrya and that Pratīpa is himself declared in verse 42 as superior to the legendary Paraśurāma probably shows that there was no real Indian dynasty ruling the land in Kālidāsa's time. But the mention of the province

“Only one legend, the *Kālakāchārya-Kathānaka*, ‘the Story of the Teacher Kālaka,’ tells us about some events which are supposed to have taken place in Ujjain and other parts of Western India during the first part of the first century B.C., or immediately before the foundation of the Vikrama Era in 58 B.C. This legend is perhaps not totally devoid of all historical interest. For it records how the Jain saint Kālaka, having been insulted by King Gardabhilla of Ujjain, who, according to various traditions, was the father of the famous Vikramāditya, went in his desire for revenge to the land of the Śakas, whose king was styled ‘King of Kings’ (Sāhāṇu-sāhi). This title, in its Greek and Indian forms, was certainly borne by the Śaka kings of the Punjab, Maues and his successors, who belong to this period; and as it actually appears in the form *Shatonano Shao* on the coins of their successors, the Kushāṇa monarchs, we are perhaps justified in concluding that the legend is to some extent historical in character. However this may be, the story goes on to tell us that Kālaka persuaded a number of Śaka satraps to invade Ujjain and overthrow the dynasty of Gardabhilla; but that, some years afterwards, his son, the glorious Vikramāditya, repelled the invaders and re-established the throne of his ancestors. What the historical foundation of this legend may be, is wholly uncertain—perhaps it contains faint recollections of the Scythian dominion in Western India during the first century B.C. In any case, it seems undoubtedly to give further proof of the connexion of the Jains with Ujjain, a fact indicated also by their use of the Vikrama Era, which was established in the country of Mālwa, of which Ujjain was the capital.” (Charpentier, pp. 167-8).

“But a few years later, c. 75 B.C., there arose another formidable power on the west. The Scythians (Śakas) of Seistān had occupied the delta of the Indus, which was known thereafter to Indian writers as Śakadvīpa, ‘the doab of the Śakas,’ and to the Greek geographers as Indo-Scythia. The memory of an episode in the history of Ujjayini as it was affected by this new element in Indian

shows that there was a separate kingdom there. I therefore infer that foreigners were probably reigning there. If Māhīśmatī, the capital, was to the south of Ujjayinī in Avanti, and the same as the modern Mandhātā on the Narmadā in the Nimār district of C. P.,¹ the province was probably under Śaka rule in the middle of the first century B.C., possibly even after Vikramāditya's driving away of the Śakas from the Ujjayinī region. But Śaka rule also prevailed there in the fourth century A.D., in whose last decade Candragupta II

politics may possibly be preserved in the Jain story of Kālaka, which is told in chapter VI, pp. 167-8. The story can neither be proved nor disproved; but it may be said in its favour that its historical setting is not inconsistent with what we know of the political circumstances of Ujjayinī at this period. A persecuted party in the state may well have invoked the aid of the warlike Śakas of Śakadvīpa in order to crush a cruel despot; and, as history has so often shown, such allies are not unlikely to have seized the kingdom for themselves. Both the tyrant Gardabhilla, whose misdeeds were responsible for the introduction of these avengers, and his son Vikramāditya, who afterwards drove the Śakas out of the realm, according to the story, may perhaps be historical characters; and, from the account which represents Vikramāditya as having come to Ujjayinī from Pratishthāna, we may infer that they were connected with the Andhras.* It is possible that we may recognise in this story the beginnings of that long struggle between the Andhras and the Śakas for the possession of Ujjayinī, the varying fortunes of which may be clearly traced when the evidence of inscriptions becomes available in the second century A.D.† With the imperfect documents at our disposal, we can do little more than suggest such possibilities. It is hopeless to attempt to discriminate between the elements which may be historical and others which are undoubtedly pure romance in the great cycle of legend which has gathered around the name, or rather the title, Vikramā-

¹ See, C.H.I., I, pp. 173, 531 and map 5, also map in Pargiter's *Ancient Indian Historical Traditions*.

* These kings belonged probably to the family of Gardabhillas, who appear in the *Purāṇas* among the successors of the Andhras; see *Kālī Age*, pp. 44-6, 72.

† B. M. Cat., *Andhras, etc.*, pp. xxxv, xxxvi.

conquered these parts from the Western Satraps. The passage is therefore indecisive for our purpose and we may pass on to the next king, Suśea of Śūrasena. This prince is described in v. 46 as belonging to the legendary Nīpa family¹ and the same logic ought to indicate that there was a foreign power reigning in Mathurā regions in Kālidāsa's time. The Śakas were certainly there in the first century B. C.² But can any such thing be said in the Gupta period? The Arjunāyanas, an old Kṣatriya tribe,³ were reigning to the west of the Mathurā region in Samudra-Gupta's time as his feudatories (Allahabad Inscription, l. 22) and Mathurā was certainly included within Gupta territory, as the votive (?)

ditya, 'the Sun of Might.' Many kings at different periods and in different countries of India have been so styled; and it seems that the exploits of more than one of them have been confused even in those legends which may be regarded as having some historical basis. While it is possible, nay even probable, that there may have been a Vikramāditya who expelled the Śakas from Ujjayinī in the first century B.C., it is certain that the monarch who finally crushed the Śaka power in this region was the Gupta emperor, Candragupta II Vikramāditya (380—414 A.D.). Indian tradition does not distinguish between these two. It regards the supposed founder of the era, which began in 58 B.C., (p. 571), and the royal patron of Kālidāsa, who lived more than four hundred years later, as one and the same person." (Rapson, pp. 532-3).

I am trying to show that our poet lived in the court of Gardabhilla's son (Vikramāditya) and not Candragupta II (Vikramāditya). But I am not concerned with the personality of the founder of the Sambat Era. Sarasvatī, referred to above in my text, was Kālakācārya's sister and a nun. Gardabhilla violated her and brought on himself the vengeance of Kālaka Sūri.

¹ Nīpa, the founder of the line belongs to the South Pañcāla dynasty and is No. 66 in Pargiter's list (Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 148). See *ibid.*, pp. 117, 166, 281.

² See Kālakasūriprabandha (in Prabhāvakacarita), v. 67 "पञ्चलनाटदेशेऽग्रेभूपान् जिह्वाय सर्वतः । शका मालवमन्थि ते प्रापुराक्रान्तविद्विषः ॥" V. A. Smith, E.H.I.,⁴ p. 241; Rapson, C.H.I., I, p. 526.

³ Gaṇapāṭha on Pāṇini, IV, 2. 80 ; C.H.I., I, p. 526.

stone inscription at Mathurā of Candragupta II (Fleet's No. 4) clearly indicates. Kālidāsa's mention of a king at Mathurā and the manner of his description can therefore be understood only in the first century B. C. As Kālidāsa's contemporary ruler (or Satrap) of Mathurā did not belong to a native dynasty, he had to select Indumati's contemporary from the pre-historic period. But does "नृपं तमावर्तमनोज्ञाभिः सा व्यत्यगादन्यवधूर्मवित्री । महीधरं मार्गवशादुपेतं स्रोतोवहा सागरगामिनीव ॥" (v. 52) indicate that Kālidāsa was now thinking of the contemporary ruler, an undesirable foreign Satrap, fit to be likened to an obstruction?

The next king is Mahendra of Kalinga about whom I have already said much. The reference to the Spice Islands and their produce in verse 57 ("द्वीपान्तरानीतलवङ्गपुष्पैरपाकृतस्वेदलवामरुद्धिः") is, as pointed out by Mr. Sankara,¹ intelligible after 75 B. C., the date of Kalinga colonisation of Sumatra and is a humorous bit of anachronism in Kālidāsa's usual style. I shall once again draw attention of my readers to Ra. VI, 58 c. d. "तस्मादपावर्तत दूरकृष्टा नीत्येव लक्ष्मीः प्रतिकूलदैवात्" and my explanation of it in the light of Khāravela's mischiefs in the territory of the Bhojakas.² After Mahendra comes the king of Pāṇḍya to whom Kālidāsa has forgotten to give a name³. I need not say here anything more about this king. "सञ्चारिणी दीपशिखेव रात्रौ यं यं व्यतीयाय पतिवरा सा । नरेन्द्रमार्गाट् इव प्रपेदे विवर्णभावं स स भूमिपालः ॥" probably sums up without specific mention Indumati's passage before some other kings. We have next the description of Aja and Indumati's bashful acceptance of this prince. As Aja belongs to the original story we should

¹ I.H.Q., I, p. 315.

² That Rāṣṭrikas and Bhojakas do not mean particular peoples, outside the Kalinga territory, but Khāravela's own provincial and local (!) governors (Lüder, E. I., X, suppl. p. 161, R. D. Banerji, J. B. O. R. S., III, p. 500) seems impossible to me. I have Mr. Jayaswal (J.B.O.R.S., III, p. 455) and Mr. Rapson (C. H. I., I, p. 535) on my side. Mr. Jayaswal rightly says, "But nobody would think it important enough to mention in an inscription the respect one receives from one's servants or officers."

³ Or was it because the poet could not coin a name from the Purāṇas for the "इन्द्रदीवरस्यामृतनुः" Dravidian chief?

not suppose that Kālidāsa has alluded to a contemporary king of Ayodhyā. No historical conclusion should therefore be drawn from this separate mention of the state of Uttara-Kośala¹ and I must now take leave of the sixth canto of the Raghuvamśa.

But leave of the Raghuvamśa we may not take yet. The Gupta period theorists will say here that allusions to the Gupta kings and to their family are too many and too obvious in the Raghuvamśa to admit of any explanation other than the Gupta patronage of Kālidāsa. But we should remember that the Guptas are not really kings of Avanti with which tradition associates Kālidāsa's Vikramāditya and where the poet certainly lived. The large number of derivatives of the root *gup*² are noticed in Kālidāsa only

¹ The Gupta period theorists need not therefore be troubled by the fact that Ayodhyā was included within and was a capital of the Gupta empire (V. A. Smith, E. H. I., p. 310). My own attitude is just this : I do not want to read history, where it is not called for. The texts should be studied from their own points of view and if any historical conclusions can be deduced they should not contradict the internal data of the texts. This is unfortunately not usually done ; in the question of Kālidāsa's date, we have often theory first and interpretation of the text afterwards, instead of text before theory. Similarly historical facts should not be interpreted in the light of Kālidāsa and then compared with his own statements ! Mr. Radha Govinda Basak's paper on the "Historical basis for Raghū's conquests" though very learned and full of acute suggestions is vitiated by this mixing up of evidence. "तत्र स्कन्दं नियतवसति... रक्षादिभिः... यः यैनां वयूनाम्..." in Me. 47 (or 44) is taken to suggest "that at the time of the composition of that great lyric Skanda-Gupta had his residence fixed in Avanti, probably in Ujjain and that he was placed in charge of the king's (cf. the title *Mahendrāditya* as used by king Kumāra-Gupta I) army." (Proceedings of the Calcutta Oriental Conference, p. 326). But unfortunately for Mr. Basak, Kālidāsa places Skanda not in Ujjayinī but on Mount Devagiri (mentioned in the previous verse) which is at some real distance from that city. How is it also known that Skanda-Gupta as a prince was a general of his father's troops stationed in Ujjayinī ? The chronological order of the different works of Kālidāsa should also be fixed on purely internal evidence and not on supposed historical allusions. The Kumārasambhava which is certainly earlier than the Raghuvamśa is placed by some scholars after that work just to suit the theories about the historical allusions !.

² To which Professor Dr. Meghnad Saha of our Physics Department draws my attention.

on account of the theory. *A similar list can be made out from Aśvaghōṣa's works but no one will dare suggest that the Buddhist philosopher lived in the Gupta period. Samudra and Candra are too familiar terms in poetic vocabulary to call for any especial notice or historical explanation in the case of Kālidāsa's use. I would not urge any grammatical objection against the late Mr. Harinath Dey's interpretation of "आसमुद्रचितीशानाम्" (Ra. I., 5), for a secondary meaning of 'lords of the earth since Samudra-Gupta' is *a-priori* not impossible.¹ But when I compare the other alleged references to Samudra-Gupta or Candra-Gupta I lose all faith in this method. If the Guptas were lords of the earth since Samudra-Gupta, the poet could not possibly speak of his son Candra-Gupta II as *purer* than him; for that would be the meaning of Ra. I, 12, "तदन्वये शुद्धिमति प्रसूतः शुद्धिमत्तरः। दिलीप इति राजेन्दुरिन्दुः क्षीरनिघाविव ॥" Above all, Ra. XVII, 71 "प्रवृद्धौ हियते चन्द्रः समुद्रोऽपि तथाविधः। स तु तत्समवृद्धिश्च न चाभूत्ताविव क्षयी" clearly shows that Kālidāsa never wanted to flatter the Gupta kings Samudra-Gupta and Candra-Gupta II. If Dilīpa is incidentally likened to Candra-Gupta II, born of Samudra-Gupta, in Ra. I, 12, how do you explain Ra. III, 17 "निवातपद्मस्तिमितेन चक्षुषा नृपस्य कान्तं पिबतः सुताननम्। महोदधेः पूर इवेन्दुदर्शनाद् गुरुः प्रहर्षः प्रबभूव नात्मनि ॥" where the self-same Dilīpa is compared to *Samudra* (or its swelling) and his son Raghu to *Candra*? Why do you notice only such passages as suit your theory and overlook the rest? An unprejudiced study of these references should convince one that Kālidāsa has used only the language of poetry and he has in his usual way² constantly varied his similes. As regards the alleged frequent references to Kumāra or Skanda, they may be also paralleled from the Buddhacarita; and we should not blind ourselves to*

¹ Nor would I say with a well-known Professor of English, at Calcutta that, Kālidāsa has even referred to Candra-Gupta's *Śālā* (Bengali for *Syāla* = 'brother-in-law') in Ra., XIII, 40 "विषङ्गतः पुष्पकच-
' etc.

Kālidāsa's rich fund of similes is proverbial.

the fact that Kālidāsa was a devout Śaiva¹ and frequent references to Śiva's son would be but natural here. I have already suggested one possible historical ground for the writing of the Kumārasambhava. Kālidāsa may also have been making frequent visits to the temple of Kārtikeya in Mount Devagiri, alluded to in the Meghadūta. Speaking of historical allusions, I may refer to Ra., VIII, 2 "दुरितैरपि कर्तुमात्मसात् प्रयतन्ते नृपसूनवो हि यत् । तदुपस्थितमग्रहीदजः पितुराज्ञेति न भोगतृष्ण्या ॥," where the poet has probably the well-known paricide Ajātaśatru in mind. The allusion, if meant, could hardly be understood in the fourth or fifth century A.D. Bāṇa, writing in the seventh century, has preserved for us many anecdotes of the Śuṅga period but he has throughout given us the names. Kālidāsa, if writing in the first century B.C., did not need to take the name of Ajātaśatru and his indirect reference² could be easily understood by his contemporaries.

The possible transference of the Gupta capital to Ayodhyā is supposed by some to have been alluded to in Kuśa's return to Ayodhyā, described in Raghuvaṃśa, Canto XVI. But Kuśa returned to Ayodhyā and did not go there for the first time, as the Guptas did, and Kuśa's return is most probably *given* in the legends from which Kālidāsa draws his story and not invented by the poet. The establishing of a second capital at Ayodhyā may, on the other hand, have been as much due to a wish to rival or at least imitate the glories of the famous Ikṣvākus (so beautifully sung by two of India's greatest poets) as to administrative necessities. Pure administrative necessity would probably have led to the choice of a more westerly city like Mathurā or a more central place like Allahabad. We should remember that the Guptas were Hindu revivalists and they would

¹ Compare, among others, the *nāndī-śloka*s of the Mālavikāgnimitra, the Vikramorvaśīya and the Abhijñānaśakuntala, the *bharata-vākya* of the last, the first verse of the Raghuvaṃśa and the theme of the Kumārasambhava.

² Of course, if meant.

naturally choose a royal city famous in Hindu tradition. Some direct influence of Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa is possible here. I have already spoken of a possible influence of this epic on the conduct of Samudra-Gupta. I have a suspicion that the early Gupta kings were great admirers of Kālidāsa's works. One work of our poet was probably carried to Magadha (and Bengal) by some Gupta king. The Bengali recension of the Śakuntalā spells the name of the hero as *Duṣmanta*,¹ whereas all other texts spell it as *Duṣyanta*, even the Kashmir recension² which is in many respects similar to the Bengali text. The inference is natural that in the first codex of the drama brought to Bengal the subscript *y* was misread as *m*. The two letters, therefore, or their forms in subscript were so very similar that one could be mistaken for the other ; but as *y* seldom changes form in a ligature the ordinary letters *y* and *m* must have had the same look. We find this similarity in the Bilsad Stone Pillar Inscription of the time of Kumāra-Gupta (Fleet's No. 10, Plate V).³ I therefore infer that the arch codex of the Bengali Śakuntalā was brought some time in the reign of Kumāra-Gupta or in that of his father Candragupta II, the conqueror of Mālwa. A drama would ordinarily circulate within narrow limits, unless specially favoured by the position of the writer. But a good poem would reach distant regions earlier than the dramas of the same author. Aśvaghoṣa's Śāriputraprakaraṇa, for example, had a more limited circulation⁴ than his poems. Similarly Kālidāsa's dramas too may have been for long confined more or less to the Malwan stage and been carried to distant Magadha and Bengal by

¹ See, e.g., Pt. Prem Chand Tarkavāgīśa's text, Calcutta, 1860, p. 3.

² See Burkhard's Die Kashmirer Sakuntalā-Handschrift, Vienna, 1884, p. 21.

³ See Table IV, column IV, rows 31 and 32 in Bühler's Indische Palaeographie (Tafeln) and the form of the *m* in *Brahmanya-devasya* of the Bilsad Inscription, l. 7, in Fleet's plate.

⁴ As is clearly indicated by its total disappearance from India.

only Candra-Gupta II, conqueror of Malwa, or his son. In mediæval Bengali versions of the Śakuntalā story and in some Bengal manuscripts of the Mahābhārata too we find the spelling *Duṣmanta*, obviously under the influence of the popular drama of Kālidāsa as current in Bengal. But there are manuscripts in Bengali character, e.g., some of the Mss. of the Padmapurāṇa used by my friend Professor Haradatta Śarmā for his text of selections from the Padma-Purāṇa,¹ which spell the name as *Duṣyanta*.

That the nineteenth canto of the Raghuvamśa was not the last, as Mr. S. P. Pandit supposed,² cannot be seriously believed. The fact that the poet has rushed a number of unimportant kings through the eighteenth canto shows that the poet is coming towards the end. But an artistic winding up required that there should be a little more leisurely movement and we have that in the nineteenth canto. The amours of Agnivarṇa in the last canto of the Raghuvamśa correspond to the eighth canto of the (unfinished) Kumārasambhava, the last that left his pen. But this nineteenth canto of the Raghuvamśa does not show that the writer was a voluptuary; Kālidāsa's moral tone is fully manifest in vv. 18—53. Agnivarṇa's tragical culmination conveys a moral and is suggestive to historians. Kālidāsa probably saw the inglorious end of a glorious line of kings through the debaucheries of the last king. And that line was most probably the family of the Śuṅgas with whom Kālidāsa was in deep sympathy and the Agnivarṇa among the Śuṅgas was probably Devabhūmi who was slaughtered by his indignant Brahmin minister Vasudeva.³ It should be noticed that Kālidāsa makes the ministers of Agnivarṇa hide the news of the king's death and secretly

¹ Padmapurāṇa and Kālidāsa, Calcutta, 1925.

² Preface to his edition of Ra., Vol. III, preface, pp. 14-18.

³ “अमात्यो वसुदेवस्तु बाल्याद् व्यसनिनं वृषम् । देवभूमिं तथोत्पादय शुङ्गेषु भविता वृषः ” (Pargiter, D.K.A., pp. 33-4), “अतिस्त्रीम्ङ्गरतमनङ्गपरवशं शुङ्गसमाप्त्यो वसुदेवो देवभूतिदासीदु-
हिला देवाध्यक्षमया वातर्जावितमकरात् ।” (Harṣacarita Uc. VI, Vidyāsāgar's ed., p. 173, Nirnaysagar ed., p. 199).

consume his body in fire under the pretext of performing some propitiatory rites for the king's recovery. Some connexion with what Vasudeva Kāṇva did is quite evident. I may also point out that the names of many of the Śuṅga kings ended in—*mitra*=the Sun and the Śuṅgas could therefore be thought of in connexion of the Raghus of the solar race. Another sensual king could have been also thought of by our poet when he wrote of Agnivarṇa, viz., Gardabhilla of Avanti, who brought on great misfortune to his whole kingdom by his debaucheries culminating in the forcible abduction of Sarasvatī, the sister of Kālakācārya. It is possible, as I have said already, that this Gardabhilla came at the end of the Gardabhilla dynasty and was not Gardabhilla I.¹ Nurture of his son (Vikramāditya) under Śātavāhana protection and the regaining of the family glory through that prince may have something in common with the careful nourishing of the posthumous son, the hope of Agnivarṇa's line, referred to at the end of the Raghuvaṃśa. *Āditya* of the Malwan prince's name or epithet easily lends itself to a veiled comparison with the kings of the solar dynasty. The Raghuvaṃśa was, therefore, not purely tragical in its culmination; it ends with a hope for a glorious king.

That Kālidāsa could be contemporary with Agnimitra, as is inferred by Mr. S. Ray² from only the *bharata-vākya* of the Mālavikāgnimitra, “आशास्यमभ्यधिगमात् प्रभृति प्रजानां सम्पद्यते न खलु गोहरि नाग्निमित्रे”, seems to me to be altogether impossible. Agnimitra's foibles as well as his excellences and also those of Irāvati (and Dhārīṇī) are described in the drama with a certain amount of humorous freedom and it is absurd that a contemporary poet could thus flatter Agnimitra. That there is something strange in the *bharata-vākya* I admit; but acknowledging a problem is better than offering a cheap

¹ The Śaka interregnum would create a gap and continuity of the line through this gap would not be spoken of. A culmination of the line, in Sarasvatī's transgressor seems therefore more natural.

² Sakuntalā, 5th ed., 1920, Introduction, pp. 28, 29.

explanation. Kālidāsa could simply have begun his literary career when the Śuṅgas were still reigning and the Mālavikāgnimitra certainly belongs to this early period.¹ It is also possible that the regular type of the Bharatavākya had not yet been fixed by usage. I have already drawn attention to the fact that Bāṇabhaṭṭa has preserved some Śuṅga traditions. It is therefore *a-priori* not impossible for a fifth century writer, living in Malwa, not far from Vidiśā, the home of the Śuṅgas, to know much of these princes. Still so many are the minute historical details preserved in the Mālavikāgnimitra—details such as tally with known facts and are such that critical scholars of the present day feel disposed to utilise for the construction of history²—that it is difficult to believe that they could be all remembered after six or seven centuries. I therefore think that Kālidāsa wrote his drama within a century of the reigns of Puṣyamitra and Agnimitra, when their memory was still fresh in popular memory. The Mālavikāgnimitra was Kālidāsa's first drama³ and he was then a novice in his art. He would therefore hardly dare to be very original in his story and would rather follow facts closely. It is probably in the love incidents alone that Kālidāsa has been original—even Mālavikā's misfortunes and subsequent admission into Agnimitra's household and marriage with him may have been given by history. However, I do not wish to press the evidence of the Mālavikāgnimitra for fixing Kālidāsa's date, for I cannot prove that Kālidāsa had not some *kāvya* or historical work about the Śuṅgas before him. A later drama, the Mudrārākṣasa,⁴ reproducing

¹ Either Devabhūmi (82-72 B.C. ?) or his predecessor Bhāga-vata (114-82 B.C. ?) may have been then reigning.

² Cf. Rapson, C.H.I., Vol. I, Ch. XXI.

³ Compare the apologetic tone in the prologue.

⁴ The date of this drama is wholly uncertain but that it belongs to a post-Christian epoch (perhaps later than the century to which Kālidāsa is usually assigned) may be taken for granted. See Keith, Sanskrit Drama, p. 204.

Opposite to p. 157.



Terracotta Plaque from Bhitā. (Reproduced from photograph kindly supplied by the Director-General of Archaeology, India.)



The same. (Reproduced from the Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, by kind permission of the Cambridge University Press, London.)

traditions of a still earlier epoch was based, according to Dhanika, on the Br̥hatkathā.¹

The evidence of the Bhiṭā medallion, on which Mr. S. Ray² has pinned his faith so much, fails to convince me, and I shall not cite it in favour of a first century B.C. theory. How can we be altogether certain that it is a work of the Śuṅga period? Then, does it really picture the opening scene of the Śakuntalā? We have a fine reproduction now of the medallion in an easily accessible volume³ and its close scrutiny reveals important differences. There is no deer running before the horses. It cannot be urged that want of space to the right hand side induced the engraver to put the deer at the bottom, for we have two animals there and not one as in Kālidāsa's story. Then Kālidāsa makes two hermits (three in the Devanāgarī recension) come and stop the king from his cruel quest, whereas we have here only one individual standing before the horses, with hands outstretched (to bid the party welcome?). Again, the person driving the horses with a whip in his right hand looks youthful and has got something like a crown on his head and can hardly answer to Duṣyanta's elderly charioteer. The other person seated on the chariot has neither a crown on his head nor a bow in his hand. Then again, who are the individuals at the top of the medallion? With all these fundamental differences, how can the picture represent the opening scene of Kālidāsa's immortal drama? I therefore set aside the allegation that its testimony places Kālidāsa in the first century B.C. or earlier,⁴ and I place

¹ Avaloka of Dhanika, com. on the Daśarūpaka, Nirṇaya-āgar edition, Bombay, 1917, p. 34. No such tradition is on record about Kālidāsa's obligations. May we, not therefore conclude that he had only living memory of the Śuṅgas to go by?

² Śakuntalā, Introduction, pp. 9-10. Mr. Sankara too has used its testimony with approbation (I.H.Q., Vol I, p. 313).

³ Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Plate XXIX. See two impressions of the plaque in the annexed plate.

⁴ With much diffidence I propose to take the plaque as depicting the scene of the aged man sent by the gods (pictured at the top?) to create the first impression of *vairāgya* in the prince Siddhārtha's

my hopes on the nature of the resemblances between Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa, as hinted in my *pratijñā* verses. My case fails if those resemblances (by the decisive character of some and the cumulative effect of the rest) do not establish my point. But my present conviction is that they do¹ and in such a way that if Kālidāsa is not removed from the fourth or the fifth century after Christ, Aśvaghoṣa will have to be brought down from the Kuṣān period or all the passages in his works resembling Kālidāsa will have to be pronounced as post-Kālidāsean interpolations. If such an *abhyanpagama* is made by anybody for the sake of argument, I am certainly silenced. But “उत्पत्स्यतेऽस्ति मम कोऽपि समानधर्मा, कालो ह्ययं निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी.”

I have not answered one very strong set of arguments, against an early date for Kālidāsa, viz., those based on Kālidāsa's knowledge of (Grecian) astronomy and astrology. This I leave to more competent hands. I may, however, ‘द्विजातिभावादुपपन्नचापलः’ make a few remarks here. Kālidāsa certainly knew the *rāśis* and the planets and probably also the *lagna* (and perhaps the week days too). But when the Sarnath inscription of ~~Raja Aśvaghoṣa of c. 150 A.D.~~² clearly indicates the knowledge of solar days and consequently of *rāśis* on which they are based and when Āryadeva in the same century mentions *vāra* and *rāśi*,³ when the Divyāvadāna (XXXIII, p. 642) and the Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra (II. 5.23) show a knowledge

mind, when he was out on a drive. The man in front whom I take to be stretching out his hands in welcome may really be the old man with no control over his limbs. [I am informed by Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni that some Buddhist remains have been discovered in that region.]

¹ Of course such scholars as do not already possess an intimate acquaintance with Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa will not be convinced by what I have said above but such an acquaintance is essential for the correct evaluation of all internal evidence. As limitations of space obliged me to be very brief in comparing the two writers, I fear much of what I have said will remain obscure to my readers, unless they should have the texts discussed open before them when going through this paper.

² Lüder's No. 929, E.I., Vol. VIII, pp. 175-25-

³ J.A.S.B., 1898, p. 181.

of the planets, why must Kālidāsa's knowledge be made possible after 200 A.D.? Archaeologists often unconsciously suggest by their writings that inscriptions give currency to a usage,¹ but others may be excused if they believe that it is prevalent customs and knowledge that they reflect. Kauṭilya, as admitted in Mr. Sankara's earlier paper,² shows some knowledge of planets and their conjunctions. Though the genuineness of the Arthaśāstra is now doubted in several quarters, I am personally certain that it is a work of the fourth century before Christ.³ Cannot a further increase of

¹ See, e.g., Prof. Dr. Bhandarkar in the Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, p. 189, ll. 10-13.

² Q.J.M.S., IX, p. 21.

³ The work has the stamp of antiquity on it. Even the vocabulary and syntax bespeak an early date. The *vidyāsamuddreṣa* section should be particularly noticed. Its four-fold division of the *vidyās* attained such popularity that the author of the metrical Manu-Smṛti, based on a Mānava Dharma Sūtra, adopted it, though the Mānavas in olden times accepted only three *vidyās*, an information known both from the Arthaśāstra and the Nītisāra of Kāmandaka. The Manu-Smṛti is usually assigned to about 200 A.D. But my study has led me to the conclusion that the work is nearer the upper limit assigned by Bühler than the lower one. Mr. Jayaswal has placed its composition in Puṣyamitra's time and M.S., I. 99-101, II. 87, etc., support him. The Arthaśāstra should therefore be earlier than the second century B.C. That Kauṭilya defines Ānvikṣaki as Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata should also prove his antiquity. Vātsyāyana, the author of the Nyāya Bhāṣya, who certainly lived before 400 A.D. (Keith, Indian Logic and Atomism, pp. 27-8) obviously refers to "प्रदीपः सर्वविद्यानामुपायः सर्वकर्मणाम् । आश्रयः सर्वधर्माणां शब्ददर्शनात्मको मता ॥" of the Arthaśāstra, *vidyāsamuddreṣa* section (2nd ed., p. 7), in his own "सुयनान्धात्मको, ... प्रदीपः सर्वविद्यानामुपायः सर्वकर्मणाम् । आश्रयः सर्वधर्माणां विदोद्देशे प्रकीर्तितः ॥" (Nyāyabhāṣya, Viz. ed., p. 7). It should be noticed that with the author of the Arthaśāstra, Ānvikṣaki means Sāṅkhya, Yoga (= Vaiśeṣika ?) and Lokāyata, whereas Vātsyāyana understands it in the sense of Nyāya alone. Why is it that comparisons are made between Megasthenes and Kauṭilya to decide on the latter's date? Tradition says that Cāṇakya retired to forest after leaving Candragupta's government under the charge of Rākṣasa. If he wrote a manual of politics for the guidance of the Maurya, its dictates would not be necessarily binding on the conduct of Rākṣasa or his royal master. The mistake is commonly made that actual practice can be gauged from the law books. But unfortunately there has always been a great difference between theory and practice. Non-mention of Kauṭilya in Megasthenes' work cannot cast any doubt on his existence for tradition makes the Brahmin

knowledge, resulting in the use of *rāśis* and of week days, be understood in two or three centuries more? Most of the astronomical or astrological concepts found in Kālidāsa were evolved in Greece¹ earlier than the middle of the first century B.C.,

return to his forest almost immediately after Candragupta's accession and the foreign ambassador would neither meet him nor hear of him. Besides, we cannot be sure that Megasthenes did not refer to him for his work has not come down to us in its entirety but only in a few quotations in other works. It is notorious that writers of summaries often omit important facts. Can we therefore expect that the Greek and Roman historians or naturalists, who have quoted, paraphrased or summarised such passages in his work as had a bearing on their respective topics, have, between them, preserved for us all that was important in the *Indika*? I have therefore little faith in the conclusions of Dr. Otto Stein, though Professor Dr. Winternitz and some other scholars have accepted them. There are fairly old traditions extant for Kauṭilya=Āṇakya's authorship of a text on Statecraft and we may safely believe that the text published by Dr. Shama Śāstri is in its essentials the same as left the pen of Candragupta's first minister in the fourth century B.C. The figure given by the seventh century writer Daṇḍin for the extent of the work - "इयं विद्वानासाचार्यविरचिता सायण्य पटुभिः श्लोकमष्टैः संनिता" (Daśakumāracarita, 8th Uchhvāsa, N.S.P. ed. 1917, p. 256)—agrees with the Mysore text. The "*idānīm*" ('now') in Daṇḍin's statement may perhaps be with reference to the characters of the story who are placed in an early age. Dr. N. Law has given us a lengthy reply (Cal. Rev., Sept.-Dec. 1924) to Professor Winternitz's objections. Some more discussion of the question is expected shortly from Dr. Law and other scholars especially over Dr. Stein's recent evidence of *suruṭiga*=*σῦριγξ*. [See H. C. Ray on the Arthaśāstra in recent numbers of the I.A.] Whatever date scholars may finally agree upon for the Arthaśāstra, my position about Kālidāsa remains unaffected.

¹ I may not speak of the ultimate Babylonian source of Greek astronomy (and astrology), not even in view of the recent findings at Harappa and Mahenjo Daro, for I am contented to accept immediate Grecian origin of a good deal of Kālidāsa's astral lore. *Jāmītra*, if that is the true reading of Ku., VII. 1, is certainly a (happy) Sanskritisation of the Greek *δαμῆτρος*—to be paralleled by the "इष्टिड्ड" of a nineteenth century orthodox Pandit of Bengal for the English word 'stupid.' But the system of seven-day weeks need not have been borrowed from Greece or Rome. The system was in currency in Western Asia since earliest times (En. Br.¹¹ IV, p. 988), whence India could have obtained it directly. As regards the supposed Sumerian findings of the Indus region, it is too early to use their implications. The Aryans may have entered India after the Sumerians (or Elamites or whoever they may have been) left the land (or migrated southwards?) or may have failed to learn anything substantial from these more civilised natives at the first blush of their acquaintance; we have a parallel.

at least about 125 B.C., when Hipparchus made his calculations.¹ This astronomer knew, as Mr. A. C. Banerji of our Mathematics Department assures me, of all these things (and even of the precession of the Equinox). Could not these ideas have entered at least some part of India in the first quarter of the first century B.C.? In historical arguments, India is often looked upon as a small country where the same knowledge and the same customs are supposed to prevail equally everywhere. But, unfortunately, India has always been (and even now is) a vast continent, where knowledge and customs have differed (and do still differ) from province to province. Avanti in Western India was in the first century B.C. in almost as active communication with Greece and Rome, through the port of "Barygaza" (=Bhrygukaccha), as the extreme south; ² much astronomical lore could thus pour into Ujjayinī from the West through sea-faring merchants. That city early became a strong centre of astronomical studies and scientific astronomy would evolve

case in Greek history. Direct contact between western India and western Asia is, however, testified to by the *Bāveru Jātaka* (the *Suppāraka Jātaka*) and the *Periplus of the Erythræan Sea*. There could thus be a substratum of Babylonian astronomy in the astral science of Ujjayinī, which could quickly acquire a scientific character under the influence of Hipparchus and others.

¹ See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th. ed., vol. II, p. 797, for the date and origin of Greek astrology.

² See, among others, H. G. Rawlinson's *India and the Western World*, Ch. V and VI. To quote Professor Keith, "We know that Alexandria under the Lagidai became a great centre of Greek learning, and that between Alexandria and Ujjayinī through the port of Barygaza there was a brisk exchange of trade which may have aided in intellectual contact." (*Sanskrit Drama*, p. 60). The Lagidai are the Ptolemies who reigned in Egypt from the fourth century B.C. to the first. Hipparchus though a native of Bithynia (in Asia Minor) resided for some time in Alexandria (see Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*). It was from Barygaza that the embassy of king Pandion or Poros sailed about 27 B.C. (Strabo XV. 73). See *Periplus of the Erythræan Sea* (§ 48) about the trade connexions of Ujjayinī with Europe in the first century A.D. (and earlier?). Ujjayinī was "the great emporium of the period." (C.H.I., I. 517). See also Sten Konow in *Modern Review*, April, 1921, p. 467, c. 2.

there earlier than in many other parts of India. If Kālidāsa, a man of this region, shows a knowledge of scientific astronomy in a rather early epoch, one should have no matter for surprise. The manner in which Kālidāsa has paraded his astronomical learning indicates the popularity of the study in that region, and probably also its recent introduction there. The *Mṛcchakaṭika*, which I believe to be of about the same age, also makes astrological references (IX. 33, etc.). The Śātavāhana prince Hāla writing in the first century A.D. in the Andhra country shows a knowledge of week days (*Sapta-Śatī* III. 61), and that implies much knowledge of scientific astronomy and cognate astrology.¹ The close relation that the Andhras had with Ujjayinī in this period is well-known.² Can we not suppose that Kālidāsa living in Ujjayinī in the previous century possessed the knowledge of week days, *rāśis*, planets and all that gear? Ujjayinī may have been an emporium not only of merchandise but also of scientific ideas. That Kālidāsa does not seem to possess a scientific knowledge of the cause of an eclipse³ should speak for his antiquity. I could not therefore find anything in the astronomical objections to necessitate the abandoning of Aśvaghoṣa's testimony. I cannot help believing that *the current theories about the date and nature of borrowings from Greek Astronomy stand badly in need of revision.*⁴

¹ See in this connection K. P. Jayaswal in I. A., 1918, p. 112.

² C.H.I., I. pp. 531-4.

³ The interpretation of Ra., XIV. 40 proposed by S. P. Pandit has long been abandoned by scholars. The *mala* of the Moon is not the occasional obscurity but the constant dark spot. Kālidāsa is therefore earlier than, at least, Āryabhaṭṭa (500 A.D.).

⁴ I could not understand the significance of Mr. Sankara's remarks: "Now the Balance (*tulā*), which always figures as a distinct sign in Hindu astrology, was unknown even to Hipparchus (c. 125 B.C.) and appears first in Geminus and Varro (c. 100 B.C.). Kālidāsa must therefore have lived after 100 B.C." (I. II. Q., I, p. 315). What has Kālidāsa to do with the *tulā*? He does not name it. The *tulā* would form the *jāmitra* "~~house~~" only if the *lagna* was in *meṣa*. It is not true that this *rāśi* was not in the Zodiac before Geminus and Varro. The Zodiac was divided into 12 "~~houses~~"

When discussing the date of Kālidāsa I have kept in mind only the scholars who decide in favour of the fourth or fifth century A.D., because I can never seriously think of the sixth century as a possible time for our poet's life. Vatsabhaddi, the writer of the Mandasor Inscription of the time of Kumāra-Gupta II and Bandhuvarman (Fleet's No. 18—of c. 474 A.D.), was most certainly under the influence of Kālidāsa's writings.¹ And our poet can never be placed after him. I have read the inscription carefully and I could find nothing to doubt the obligation of the writer to Kālidāsa, already surmised by several scholars.² I have also noticed the influence of Kālidāsa in the Bhitāri Stone Pillar and the Junnagarh Rock inscriptions of Skanda-Gupta; but I reserve all this for a separate treatment. Bhāravi too can never be placed before Kālidāsa (see I. A., 1918, pp. 249-250). One scholar who believes in the sixth century theory gave me as his reason the fact of India being divided into a number of petty principalities in that century, a condition reflected in the Raghuvamśa. But similar conditions also prevailed in the first century B.C. when after the disintegration of the Maurya Empire and the subsequent collapse of the Śuṅgas,

since very early times. Only the "~~house~~" corresponding to the present "Balance" had no *special name*: the "Scorpion" was extended across the seventh and eighth divisions. "Libra" ('Balance') was not of Greek invention. Ptolemy, who himself chiefly used the 'Claws' (χρηλαί—part of the 'Scorpion'), speaks of it as a distinctly Chaldaean sign; and it occurs as an extra-zodiacal asterism in the Chinese sphere" (Encyclopædia Britannica, 11th ed., vol. xxviii, p. 994—see the whole article on "Zodiac"). There were 12 divisions but only 11 symbols; Geminus and Varro only introduced a *name* for the seventh *rāśi*. I beg to take exception to another statement of Mr. Saṅkara. He ascribes Amarasimha, the famous lexicographer, to the 6th century A.D. "as he follows Varāha and not Āryabhaṭṭa in equating the *manvantara* with 71 instead of 72 *mahāyugas*" (I. H. Q., I. p. 310). But Amara seems to have really followed the Manu Smṛti (I. 79), which was certainly written several centuries before the times of Āryabhaṭṭa and Varāhamihira.

¹ See Keith in J.R.A.S., 1909, pp. 433-4.

² Bühler, Kielhorn, Macdonell, Keith, Mr. Dhanapati Banerji, and others.

North India was divided into a number of small kingdoms, a condition further accelerated by the Śāka settlements in three regions, the Punjab,¹ Mathurā and Western India. In South India too, we have the Andhras (with their feudatories), the Kalingas and the other Dravidian powers unapproached even by Aśoka.

It will probably be improper for me to make no mention of the historical reference read by Mallinātha in Me., I. 14, “अदेः शृङ्गं हरति पवनः किंस्विदित्युन्मुखीभिर्दृष्टोत्साहश्चित्तचकितं मुग्ध-सिद्धाङ्गनाभिः । स्थानादस्मात् सरसनिचुलादुत्पतोदङ्मुखः खं दिङ्नागानां पथि परिहरन् स्थूलहस्तावलेपान् ॥”² Mallinātha reads here an allusion to the rivalry between a poet Nicula and the Buddhist logician Diṇṇāga, both contemporaries of Kālidāsa, and he proposes a second meaning of the verse in consonance with this allusion. The best view about Vasubandhu's date seems now to be that he lived in the first half of the fourth century A.D.³ and if Diṇṇāga was his pupil, as Buddhist

¹ It is because foreigners were reigning in the Punjab for a very long time (longer than in Mathurā or Kāthiāwād) that Kālidāsa makes no suitor come from there for Indumatī's hand.

² Particularly when my friend Pandit Amarnāth Jhā, M.A., of our English Department asks me to answer the chronological difficulty created by it.

³ See V. A. Smith, E. H. I.¹, pp. 346-7, on the basis of M. Peri's work in B. E. F. E. O. It is however no longer possible to connect Vasubandhu with the son (Samudra-Gupta) of Candragupta I on the supposed authority of Vāmana for the true reading of the passage (Kāvyaśālaṅkāra Sūtra, III. 2,2) seems to be “नाभिमायत्वं यथा—‘नाभ्यं संप्रति चन्द्रगुप्त-तनयश्चन्द्रप्रकाशो यथा । जातो भूपतिराश्रयः कृतधियां दिष्टया कृतार्थश्चः ॥’ आश्रयः कृतधियमित्यस्य च सुवन्द्युनाचिञ्चोपक्षेपपरत्वात्कामिमायत्वन ॥” (N. S. P. ed., 1895, p. 32). This Subandhu, we now know, is not the author of the highly artificial prose romance Vāsavadattā, nor is the Candragupta the Gupta king of that name. The Avantisundarikathā informs us that this Subandhu was a contemporary of the Maurya Emperor Candragupta and his son Bindusāra (p. 1); and this text and the Abhinava Bhāratī tell us that the poet captivated Bindusāra's heart by writing a drama named Vāsavadattā-Nāṭṭa (tā ?)—dhārā. See M. Ram Krishna Kavi's paper, “Avantisundarī-kathā of Daṇḍin” in the Proceedings of the

tradition asserts, ¹ he lived about the second half of the fourth century.² If Mallinātha's interpretation is accepted, Kālidāsa must be placed in the fourth century and he becomes a contemporary of Samudra-Gupta or his son Candragupta II. This would of course fit in with the theory of most scholars. But is the testimony so sure that we must accept it? Dakṣiṇāvarta-nātha (12th century) and after him Mallinātha (14th century) are the only commentators who speak of this allusion. The earlier commentator Vallabhadeva (10th century) has no inkling of it. There is no other evidence about the rivalry of a poet Nicula with the logician Diinnāga (or even of the existence of that poet) and such a rivalry is extremely improbable. Then, *the plural in "दिङ्नागानाम्" cannot be explained if Diinnāga is referred to by Kālidāsa as a rival.*³ The name of Diinnāga was a terror in later Hindu philosophical circles and Dakṣiṇāvartanātha and Mallinātha, nurtured under the influence of these schools, naturally think of the writer of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* at the sight of the word Diinnāga. The story about Nicula probably comes from pure imagination, helped by the adjective सरस-, for is not *kāvyā* defined as

Calcutta Oriental Conference, p. 196, and Rangaswami Saraswati's paper on "Vasubandhu or Subandhu" in *ibid.*, pp. 203—213 (also an article in the I. II. Q., Vol. I, pp. 261-4). I have no opinion to hazard about the identity of Vikramāditya of Ayodhyā father of Bālāditya and patron of Vasubandhu mentioned by Buddhist writers (e.g., Paramārtha in his Life of Vasubandhu).

¹ Kern, Manual of Indian Buddhism, p. 129

² See Keith's Buddhist Philosophy, p. 305.

³ Mr. Dhanapati Banerji has proposed a very queer meaning of "दिङ्नागानाम्" viz., "Buddhist savants out on mission to various places." (Q.J.M.S., X., p. 78), for which he has not given any authority and, I believe, has none. Mr. Saṅkara (*Ibid.*, p. 188) has justly criticised him and Mr. Banerji's reply (pp. 365-6) has not improved matters a bit. No historical conclusion can be arrived at by coining meanings of words at will.

rasātmaka vākya?¹ Without labouring the point further, I shall make a quotation from Professor Keith, a writer who is himself not in disfavour of Kālidāsa's contemporaneity with Candra-Gupta II: "But the difficulties of this argument are insurmountable. In the first place, it is extremely difficult to accept the alleged reference to Nicula, who is otherwise a mere name, and to Dinnāga; why a Buddhist logician should have attacked a poet does not appear, especially as every other record of the conflict is lost. Nor is the *double entendre* at all in Kālidāsa's manner; ² such efforts are little in harmony with Kālidāsa's age, while later they are precisely what is admitted, and are naturally seen by the commentators where not really intended."³ Dakṣiṇāvarta-nātha and Mallinātha, therefore, I cannot help believing, have coined a legend and not preserved a tradition. Occurrence of the story in two writers proves

¹ The rich imagination of our ancestors from the time of the writers of the Brāhmaṇas, the Anukramaṇis and the Purāṇas down to our present day Pandits, an imagination that never owns defeat before big gaps but must boldly bridge it over, was brought home to me when I was studying the traditions about the Ṛgvedic *ṛsis*. I may mention as a typical illustration the Purāṇic analysis of the name of Bharadvāja as '*bhara deāja*' and the worthless story about the sage's birth it gave rise to. Howmuchsoever one may lament it from the point of view of history, one has the consolation that this special gift of our race gave to the world a rich fund of story literature (Vedic, Purāṇic, classical, Jaina, Buddhist and vernacular). That our commentators were sometimes unscrupulous with texts is illustrated by Mallinātha's alteration of 'बलू—' in Ra., IV, 67 into 'विन्धु—,' referred to above, and of "विदग्धनीलोत्तिलदन्तपत्रिका—" the only reading of Māgha I, 60, into "विलासिनीविभ्रमदन्तपत्रिका—"(in the light of Ra., IV. 17)!

² "The allusion to Vikramāditya that I have read in Ra., VI, 31, is altogether on a different level. There is no *śleṣa* there. Kālidāsa has not descended to the vulgarity of taking the king's name directly but has used synonyms which suggest it through *vyañjanā*. Similarly *Mahendra* in v. 54 of the same canto does not refer to a Mahendra but to a Mahāmeghavāhana prince." K. C.

³ Sanskrit Drama, p. 145; see also Keith, J.R.A.S., 1909, pp. 435-6.

nothing ; Mallinātha has simply copied it from his predecessor.¹ Space forbids the answering of other objections.²

I have not tried to prove the existence of a Vikramāditya, king of Ujjayinī, in the first century B.C. for sufficient facts for such a supposition are already present before scholars, some of whom have accepted their implication.³ The

¹ Mr. H. N. Randle of our Philosophy Department draws my attention to an attempt by Dr. F. W. Thomas, in J. R. A. S., 1918, pp. 118-22, to revive the Diñnāga theory. Dr. Thomas believes that Me., I. 14 alludes to a work named *Hasta* by Diñnāga and he thinks that it is the same as the Muṣṭi-prakarāṇa-śāstra or Hastavāla-prakarāṇa, a short text preserved in Tibetan and Chinese, and ascribed by some authorities to Jina=Diñnāga and by others to Āryadeva. It contains six *kārikās* (seven in Tibetan), followed by a commentary. Dr. Thomas has sought to reconcile the difference in tradition about the authorship of the work by assuming that Āryadeva wrote the *kārikās* and Diñnāga the *vṛtti*. The Tibetan and Chinese versions have been published by Dr. Thomas and Professor Ui, preceded by a reconstructed Sanskrit text, in *ibid.*, pp. 267-310. But the introductory sentence of the commentary (p. 278) makes it clear that it is a *svopajñā-vṛtti* and diversity of authorship for the *kārikās* and the *vṛtti* is therefore an unjustifiable assumption. Then Diñnāga's claim to have any connexion with the work is not very strong. The Tibetan authorities are unanimous in naming Āryadeva and Chinese tradition is not really agreed, as Dr. Thomas himself admits (p. 271), in making Diñnāga the author. That Kālidasa refers to a work named *Hasta* is not asserted by Mallinātha and is difficult to understand. Nor do I see how Dr. Thomas finds support for Kālidasa's alleged reference to Diñnāga's *sthūla-hastā*=*vulva* in verse 5 of the Hastavāla (p. 119), for there is no mention of *sthūlatva* there ; we have instead *sūkṣma-buddhi*. He himself reconstructs the verse as " सर्वज्ञैर्गतिं येन विदधते मूढमबुद्धिना । तथैवेत्य बुद्धिमान् सुन्दु रक्षहिमयं यथा ॥ " (p. 285).

² Some reference to the nature of the relation between Kālidāsa and the Padma Purāṇa may be demanded of me. My friend Professor Haradatta Sarmā has tried to show in his recent "Padma-purāṇa and Kālidāsa, Calcutta, 1925" that Kālidāsa is indebted to the Purāṇa for his variations in the Raghuvamśa and Śakuntalā stories and for many verbal suggestions. Professor Dr. Winternitz writes in the Foreword that he accepts his pupil's conclusions. But careful study of the text published by my friend and of his discussions on it failed to convince me. The view that Kālidāsa has drawn on the Padma Purāṇa is generally prevalent among orthodox scholars and naturally so. But anyone who takes the trouble of reading the text of the Purāṇa published by my friend with an open mind will be convinced that Professor Macdonell and other modern scholars are justified in placing the Padma Purāṇa after Kālidāsa.

³ See the two extracts from the C.H.I., quoted above.

genuineness of the *Saptasatī* as a work of Hāla Śātavāhana and its reference to (this?) Vikramāditya's liberality (V. 64), though doubted in certain quarters, also seems in no need of fresh proof. I am not concerned with the personality of the founder of the Sambat era. Let historians decide whether Azes I or Gautamīputra Śātakarni¹ or any other individual founded it. What I have sought to prove is the existence of our poet Kālidāsa in the time of Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, avenger of Gardabhilla's overthrow. I have shown that Aśvaghoṣa knew and used two of the poems of Kālidāsa. Had Kālidāsa been the borrower, his debts would have been found most in his first poem, the *Ṛtusamhāra* but I have not discovered any single resemblance between that poem and any passage or passages in the *Saundarananda* or the *Buddhacarita*. The reason for Aśvaghoṣa's non-use of this lyric is not far to seek; the work is not of great merit and would then hardly pass beyond the limits of

¹ Mr. Harit Krishna Deb in the *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*, 1922, pp. 250—302; but I am not convinced by his arguments. He has made this Śātavāhana prince live in the first century B.C. and he has identified him with the Vikrama of tradition. Nor am I sure about Sir John Marshall's theory. [Is there any connexion between Azes and Kālidāsa's Aja, justifying the assumption of a matrimonial alliance between the houses of southern Ujjayinī (or say of Pratiṣṭhāna) and of northern Takṣaśilā? Or, if there is any reference to Vikramāditya in the title of the *Vikramorvaśīya*, could the contemporary counterpart of the *apsaras* Urvāśī possibly be a Śaka princess? Vikramāditya could thus have come to the throne through the help of, among others, another Śaka chief—काटकेन काटकोद्धरणम्? The era could thus have been jointly founded by Azes and Vikramāditya. The previous Śaka satraps of Taxilā probably belonged to a rival house (so asserts Smith in *E. H. I.*², p. 243 but doubts Rapson in *C. H. I.*, I, p. 568). However, these suggestions are not very seriously meant and I disown competence to decide the question.] There is of course no inherent improbability in the assumption that the era was founded by Azes and made current in Avanti by the Śaka overthrowers of Gardabhilla (sometime after 58 B. C.?) and that when the Śakas were driven out by Vikramāditya, the national feeling of the people caused the alteration of the name with which the era was originally associated into that of the liberator of Ujjayinī. Vikramāditya would then have come to the throne about 50 B.C. or later. I do not suppose that the Jaina legend about Kālika and Gardabhilla is to be accepted in block.

Kālidāsa's native province. It has come down to us only on account of its association with the great name of Kālidāsa.¹ The Meghadūta too has not been used much by Aśvaghoṣa ; this poem, though a work of great merit, is also less known generally than the epics Kumārasambhava and the Raghuvaṃśa. The Buddhist writer therefore chose such works of the poet as were most popular (or as I might say, "people were mad after") and tried to improve on them in his own way.² A somewhat similar story is told by the Śiśupālavadha of Māgha, a conscious effort at excelling the Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi. Māgha has only written a more artificial poem and his lack of originality and inartistic hyperboles make one doubt if we have an improvement here.³ Aśvaghoṣa with a better gift but no poet's training has escaped the same sorry fate ; but that his poems are no improvements on Kālidāsa's requires no proving. I have already spoken

¹ I have thrown out the suggestion that Kālidāsa left the Kumārasambhava incomplete and he did not publish it himself, though he wrote and published other works after it ; its preservation must be due to Kālidāsa's popularity. [Besides Ku., VII, 56--69 reproduced *mutatis mutandis* in Ra., VII, 5--16, we have another long passage in the second canto of Kumāra, the *śluti* of Brahmā by the gods and his reply, repeated with many verbal agreements in Ra., X. *Ajavitāpa* is also a parallel to *Rativitāpa* and the nineteenth canto of Ra., to the last in Ku., that left Kālidāsa's pen. All this shows that (1) Kālidāsa was giving publicity to some of the nice passages in an unpublished (or suppressed ?) work and (2) that he was repeating his own words and not those of another writer.] As fire cannot lie hidden under the cover of linen, the Kumārasambhava could not long remain in obscurity and reached even distant Sāketa in less than two centuries, a fate that was denied to the Rtasamhāra, whose chief recommendation in our eyes is the dawn of Kālidāsa's poetical powers that it reveals.

² But probably in trying to improve on Kālidāsa, he imbibed so much of this poet's devotion to beauty that he himself represented Upagupta as longing for a beautiful vision of Buddha. See the story of Upagupta and Māra of the Sūtrālaṅkāra (pp. 263-73), preserved in the Divyāvadāna (particularly pp. 361-2). The professed philosopher turned to poetry to get popular hearing but ended by building up a synthesis of philosophy and poetry, of reason and sentiment, in that charming form of Buddhism, the Mahāyāna, whose precursor Aśvaghoṣa certainly was.

³ My strictures on Māgha's poem must not be taken to imply a refusal to admit any good points in that work.

of the influence of Darwin's theory on contemporary scientific thought. But we should not make a fetish of it ; fetishism is least in accord with science. Evolution is a truth but decay is not an illusion. And then human thought and its products cannot be brought under mechanically regular laws of nature. If Aśvaghoṣa is to be believed as Kālidāsa's predecessor, the latter's borrowing should be *proved* and *not assumed*. It is possible that I have misunderstood the indications of the resemblances recorded above but the importance of the question demands that scholars should try to set me right. This kindness I crave of my readers for my own aim has throughout been to know the truth. I want to be convinced that scholars are not deciding in favour of the Gupta period or a later date under the hypnotic influence of repeated assertions to this effect by a host of writers, Indian and European, an influence which has often claimed me its votary like the repeated statements (may I hope ?) that induced a simple Brahmin to look upon a sacrificial goat as a vile dog.

I therefore conclude with the prayer :

“तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय”

Besides the gentlemen named above who have laid me under obligation by listening to my arguments or reading this paper in proof or in any other way, I must mention here my revered teachers, MM. Dr. Jhā and Pt. G. Kavirāj, and my friends Prof. Dr. S. K. Chatterji, Dr. H. Ray Chaudhuri, Dr. Pashupatināth Shāstri, Pt. Batuknāth Sharmā, Prof. G. Gupta, Prof. J. De, Pt. Ishwari Prasad and Mr. R. M. Shāstri ; I offer my thanks to all of them. Nor must I omit to thank the Manager of the Indian Press and his staff who have conformed to my wishes at great sacrifice.

S.P.—It will be seen above that I have not used the simplicity of Kālidāsa's style as an argument ; for it is possible for a late writer to write in a simple style. But the fewer rhetorical ornamentations used by the poet might be used as a corroborative evidence. Kālidāsa's vocabulary and metre will give us much help but they require separate treatment.

The new Ayodhyā inscription of Dhana (-deva), the sixth (brother ?) of Puṣyamitra and ruler of North Kośala, shows Śuṅga rule there and may be used as a match for the argument (pp. 152-3) based on Gupta connexions in Ayodhyā. अयोध्यापतये नमः ॥

Scholars to whom copies of this paper are being sent are requested to favour the writer with their criticisms and opinions.

